

# **Union Calendar No. 695**

114th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - House Report 114-885

**REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES**  
**OF THE**  
**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**  
**FOR THE**  
**ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS**



DECEMBER 22, 2016.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

**REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

# Union Calendar No. 695

114th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - House Report 114-885

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
FOR THE  
ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS



DECEMBER 22, 2016.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

23-125

WASHINGTON : 2016

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

WILLIAM M. “MAC” THORNBERRY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	ADAM SMITH, Washington
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
JEFF MILLER, Florida	ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
ROB BISHOP, Utah	RICK LARSEN, Washington
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	JACKIE SPEIER, California
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
DUNCAN HUNTER, California	SCOTT H. PETERS, California
JOHN FLEMING, Louisiana	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada	DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	RUBEN GALLEGO, Arizona
MO BROOKS, Alabama	GWEN GRAHAM, Florida
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida	BRAD ASHFORD, Nebraska
PAUL COOK, California	SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma	PETE AGUILAR, California
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio	(Vacancy)
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana	(Vacancy)
BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama	
SAM GRAVES, Missouri	
RYAN K. ZINKE, Montana	
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York	
MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona	
STEPHEN KNIGHT, California	
THOMAS MACARTHUR, New Jersey	
STEVE RUSSELL, Oklahoma	

ROBERT L. SIMMONS II, *Staff Director*  
ZACH STEACY, *Director, Legislative Operations*

## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, December 22, 2016.*

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MS. HAAS: Pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I present herewith the report on the activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 114th Congress.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY, *Chairman.*



## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Powers and Duties .....	1
Committee Rules .....	4
Composition of the Committee on Armed Services .....	17
Committee Staff .....	23
Committee Meetings and Hearings .....	25
Legislative Activities .....	25
Oversight Activities .....	31
Publications .....	123



## Union Calendar No. 695

114TH CONGRESS } 2d Session }	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES {	REPORT 114-885
----------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

---

---

### REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

---

DECEMBER 22, 2016.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Armed Services,  
submitted the following

### R E P O R T

#### POWERS AND DUTIES

##### BACKGROUND

The House Committee on Armed Services, a standing committee of Congress, was established on January 2, 1947, as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812), by merging the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs. The Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs were established in 1882. In 1885, jurisdiction over military and naval appropriations was taken from the Committee on Appropriations and given to the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs, respectively. This practice continued until July 1, 1920, when jurisdiction over all appropriations was again placed in the Committee on Appropriations.

In the 93rd Congress, following a study by the House Select Committee on Committees, the House passed H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, to be effective January 3, 1975. As a result of those amendments, the jurisdictional areas of the Committee on Armed Services remained essentially unchanged. However, oversight functions were amended to require each standing committee to review and study on a continuing basis all matters and jurisdiction of the committee. Also, the Committee on Armed Services was to review and study on a continuing basis all laws, programs, and Government activities dealing with or involving international arms control and disarmament and the education of military dependents in school.

The rules changes adopted by the House (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1977, placed new responsibilities in the field of atomic energy in the Committee on Armed Services. Those responsibilities involved the national security aspects of atomic energy previously within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Public Law 95-110, effective September 20, 1977, abolished the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

With the adoption of H. Res. 658 on July 14, 1977, which established the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Service over intelligence matters was changed. That resolution gave the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence oversight responsibilities for intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs of the U.S. Government. Specifically, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has exclusive legislative jurisdiction regarding the Central Intelligence Agency and the director of Central Intelligence, including authorizations. Also, legislative jurisdiction over all intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs was vested in the permanent select committee except that other committees with a jurisdictional interest may request consideration of any such matters. Accordingly, as a matter of practice, the Committee on Armed Services shared jurisdiction over the authorization process involving intelligence-related activities.

The committee continues to have shared jurisdiction over military intelligence activities as set forth in rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

With the adoption of House rules (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1995, the Committee on National Security was established as the successor committee to the Committee on Armed Services, and was granted additional legislative and oversight authority over merchant marine academies, national security aspects of merchant marine policy and programs, and interoceanic canals. Rules for the 104th Congress also codified the existing jurisdiction of the committee over tactical intelligence matters and the intelligence related activities of the Department of Defense.

On January 6, 1999, the House adopted H. Res. 5, rules for the 106th Congress, in which the Committee on National Security was redesignated as the Committee on Armed Services.

On January 5, 2012, the House adopted H. Res. 5, rules for the 112th Congress, which clarified the Committee on Armed Services jurisdiction over Department of Defense administered cemeteries.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS AND DUTIES

The powers and duties of Congress in relation to national defense matters stem from Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides, among other things that Congress shall have power:

To raise and support Armies;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States;

To exercise exclusive Legislation . . . over all Places purchased . . . for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; and

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

#### HOUSE RULES ON JURISDICTION

Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives established the jurisdiction and related functions for each standing committee. Under the rule, all bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of any standing committee shall be referred to such committee. The jurisdiction of the House Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule X is as follows:

(1) Ammunition depots; forts; arsenals; and Army, Navy, and Air Force reservations and establishments.

(2) Common defense generally.

(3) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

(4) The Department of Defense generally, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, generally.

(5) Interoceanic canals generally, including measures relating to the maintenance, operation, and administration of interoceanic canals.

(6) Merchant Marine Academy and State Maritime Academies.

(7) Military applications of nuclear energy.

(8) Tactical intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of Defense.

(9) National security aspects of merchant marine, including financial assistance for the construction and operation of vessels, maintenance of the U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair industrial base, cabotage, cargo preference, and merchant marine officers and seamen as these matters relate to the national security.

(10) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces.

(11) Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

(12) Selective service.

(13) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

(14) Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

(15) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

(16) Cemeteries administered by the Department of Defense.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction and general oversight function, the Committee on Armed Services has special oversight functions with respect to international arms control and disarmament and the education of military dependents in schools.

#### INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY AND LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

H. Res. 988 of the 93rd Congress, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, amended clause 1(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to provide general authority for each committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction. That

amendment established a permanent investigative authority and relieved the committee of the former requirement of obtaining a renewal of the investigative authority by a House resolution at the beginning of each Congress. H. Res. 988 also amended rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives by requiring, as previously indicated, that standing committees are to conduct legislative oversight in the area of their respective jurisdiction, and by establishing specific oversight functions for the Committee on Armed Services.

The committee derives its authority to conduct oversight from, among other things, clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to general oversight responsibilities), clause 3(b) of rule X (relating to special oversight functions), and clause 1(b) of rule XI (relating to investigations and studies).

### COMMITTEE RULES

The committee held its organizational meeting on January 14, 2015, and adopted the following rules governing rules and procedure for oversight hearings conducted by the full committee and its subcommittees. (H.A.S.C. 114–1; Committee Print No. 1)

#### RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the “Committee”) and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

(b) Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee’s rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the chair of the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

#### RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., when the House of Representatives is in session, and at such other times as may be fixed by the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to as the “Chairman”), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

#### RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee Chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee Chairmen, and the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee with a view toward avoiding, whenever possible, simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

RULE 4. JURISDICTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND  
SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Jurisdiction

(1) The Committee retains jurisdiction of all subjects listed in clause 1(c) and clause 3(b) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and retains exclusive jurisdiction for: defense policy generally, ongoing military operations, the organization and reform of the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, counter-drug programs, security and humanitarian assistance (except special operations-related activities) of the Department of Defense, acquisition and industrial base policy, technology transfer and export controls, joint interoperability, detainee affairs and policy, force protection policy and inter-agency reform as it pertains to the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy. In addition the committee will be responsible for intelligence policy (including coordination of military intelligence programs), national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements that are part of the Intelligence Community. While subcommittees are provided jurisdictional responsibilities in subparagraph (2), the Committee retains the right to exercise oversight and legislative jurisdiction over all subjects within its purview under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committee shall be organized to consist of seven standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces: All Army, Air Force and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs, strategic missiles, space, lift programs, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology accounts) and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the associated weapons systems sustainment, National Guard and Army, Air Force and Marine Corps Reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Military personnel policy, Reserve Component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, depot policy, civilian personnel policy, environmental policy, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces: Navy acquisition programs, Naval Reserve equipment, and Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, lift programs, seaborne un-

manned aerial systems and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5 and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs (including national intelligence space programs), ballistic missile defense, the associated weapons systems sustainment, the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and Department of Energy national security programs.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations: Any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee, subject to the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

(b) Membership of the Subcommittees

(1) Subcommittee memberships, with the exception of membership on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively. Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all other Majority members of the subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all other Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member thereof may sit as ex officio members of all subcommittees. Ex officio members shall not vote in subcommittee hearings or meetings or be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the ratio of the subcommittees or establishing a quorum at subcommittee hearings or meetings.

(4) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee and participate during any of its hearings but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for the purpose of achieving a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the hearing.

RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

(a) Committee Panels

(1) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(2) No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman for a period of time which is not to exceed six months.

(3) Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all Majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the Majority members so appointed who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee to serve as Chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall similarly choose the Ranking Minority Member of the panel.

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(b) Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces

(1) The Chairman of the Committee, or a Chairman of a subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee, may designate a task force to inquire into and take testimony on a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, respectively. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall each appoint an equal number of members to the task force. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall choose one of the members so appointed, who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee, to serve as Chairman of the task force. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall similarly appoint the Ranking Minority Member of the task force.

(2) No task force appointed by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall continue in existence for more than three months. A task force may only be reappointed for an additional three months with the written concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee whose Chairman appointed the task force.

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

(e) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall establish criteria for recommending legislation and other matters to be considered by the House of Representatives, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such criteria shall not conflict with the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules.

#### RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing or meeting before that body at least one week before the commencement of a hearing and at least three days before the commencement of a meeting. However, if the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing or meeting sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources, and promptly made publicly available in electronic form.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, or at the time of an announcement under paragraph (a) made within 24 hours before such meeting, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(g)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(e)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the maximum extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings. The Committee shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(b) Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

#### RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the re-

spective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee or subcommittee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee or subcommittee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, one member of that member's personal staff, and an alternate, which may include fellows, with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s), panel(s), or task force(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member or fellow at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

#### RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

- (1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;
- (2) Closing Committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;
- (3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;
- (4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and
- (5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to disclose whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

#### RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) Subject to rule 15, the time any one member may address the Committee or subcommittee on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not more than five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee.

(b)(1) Members who are present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the Majority to Minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning

in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(2) Pursuant to rule 4 and subject to rule 15, a member of the Committee who is not a member of a subcommittee may be recognized by a subcommittee chairman in order of their arrival and after all present subcommittee members have been recognized.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may depart with the regular order for questioning which is specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule provided that such a decision is announced prior to the hearing or prior to the opening statements of the witnesses and that any such departure applies equally to the Majority and the Minority.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force hearings and meetings.

#### RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the full Committee Chairman and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Committee.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a pre-

pared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, a quorum being present. In cases where a witness does not submit a statement by the time required under this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may elect to exclude the witness from the hearing.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of the submitted written statement.

(c) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, written witness statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

#### RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:  
 “Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?”

#### RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, members of the Committee or subcommittee may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose according to rule 11 of the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee or subcommittee who so desire shall have not more than five minutes to question each witness or panel of witnesses, the responses of the witness or witnesses being included in the five-minute period, until such time as each member has had an opportunity to question each witness or panel of witnesses. Thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by members are within the discretion of the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee or subcommittee shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration.

#### RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, subcommittee, or panel will be published officially in substantially verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted

at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. The transcripts of markups conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee may be published officially in verbatim form. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Any transcript published under this rule shall include the results of record votes conducted in the session covered by the transcript and shall also include materials that have been submitted for the record and are covered under rule 19. The handling and safekeeping of these materials shall fully satisfy the requirements of rule 20. No transcript of an executive session conducted under rule 9 shall be published under this rule.

#### RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

(e) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or the most senior Minority member who is present at the time, may elect to postpone requested record votes until such time or point at a markup as is mutually decided. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

#### RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, Minority, additional or dissenting views, all members shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such written and signed views with the Staff Director of the Committee, or the Staff Director's designee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chairman shall cause the text of each such amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(e)(6) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote pursuant to clause 2(e)(1)B(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Information so available shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

#### RULE 20. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information that is received which is classified as Confidential or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives, staff of the Committee, or staff designated under rule 9(c) who have the appropriate security clearances and the need to know, who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee shall, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any proprietary information that is received by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force. Such procedures shall be consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives and applicable law.

#### RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel or task force designated by the Chairman or chairmen of the subcommittees shall be subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in

accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

#### RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

#### RULE 24. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Not later than January 2nd of each odd-numbered year the Committee shall submit to the House a report on its activities, pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.



## COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

### FULL COMMITTEE

Pursuant to H. Res. 6 (agreed to on January 6, 2015), H. Res. 7 (agreed to on January 6, 2015), H. Res. 29 (agreed to on January 13, 2015), H. Res. 30 (agreed to on January 13, 2015), and H. Res. 165 (agreed to on March 24, 2015), the following Members have served on the Committee on Armed Services in the 114th Congress:

WILLIAM M. “MAC” THORNBERRY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	ADAM SMITH, Washington, <i>Ranking Member</i>
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
JEFF MILLER, Florida	ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
ROB BISHOP, Utah	RICK LARSEN, Washington
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, Jr., Georgia
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	JACKIE SPEIER, California
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia	JOAQUIN CASTRO, <sup>3</sup> Texas
DUNCAN HUNTER, California	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
JOHN FLEMING, Louisiana	SCOTT H. PETERS, California
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada	BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, <sup>1</sup> Mississippi	RUBEN GALLEG0, Arizona
MO BROOKS, Alabama	MARK TAKAI, <sup>4</sup> Hawaii
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida	GWEN GRAHAM, Florida
PAUL COOK, California	BRAD ASHFORD, Nebraska
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma	SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio	PETE AGUILAR, California
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana	
BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama	
SAM GRAVES, Missouri	
RYAN K. ZINKE, Montana	
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York	
MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona	
STEPHEN KNIGHT, California	
THOMAS MACARTHUR, New Jersey	
STEVE RUSSELL, <sup>2</sup> Oklahoma	

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Palazzo resigned from the committee on Mar. 24, 2015.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Russell was elected to the committee on Mar. 24, 2015.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Castro took a leave of absence from the committee on July 6, 2016.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Takai died on July 20, 2016.

## SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The following subcommittees were established at the committee's organizational meeting on January 14, 2015.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations.

JOE WILSON, South Carolina, *Chairman*

JOHN KLINE, Minnesota	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
DUNCAN HUNTER, California	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida	JOAQUIN CASTRO, <sup>1</sup> Texas
RYAN K. ZINKE, Montana	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona, <i>Vice Chair</i>	DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	BRAD ASHFORD, Nebraska
MO BROOKS, Alabama	PETE AGUILAR, California
BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama	
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York	

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Castro took a leave of absence from the committee on July 6, 2016.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Military personnel policy, Reserve Component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada, *Chairman*

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota	ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
THOMAS MACARTHUR, New Jersey,	JACKIE SPEIER, California
<i>Vice Chair</i>	TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York	BETO O'ROURKE, Texas
PAUL COOK, California	
STEPHEN KNIGHT, California	

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, depot policy, civilian personnel policy, environmental policy, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia, *Chairman*

ROB BISHOP, Utah	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York, <i>Vice Chair</i>	JOAQUIN CASTRO, <sup>3</sup> Texas
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	SCOTT H. PETERS, California
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, <sup>1</sup> Mississippi	BETO O'ROURKE, Texas
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida	RUBEN GALLEGGO, Arizona
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio	
SAM GRAVES, MISSOURI	
STEVE RUSSELL, <sup>2</sup> Oklahoma	

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Palazzo resigned from the committee on Mar. 24, 2015.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Russell was assigned to the Subcommittee on Readiness on Mar. 24, 2015.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Castro took a leave of absence from the committee on July 6, 2016.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER AND PROJECTION FORCES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Navy acquisition programs, Naval Reserve equipment, and Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, lift programs, seaborne unmanned aerial systems and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5 and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia, *Chairman*

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, <sup>1</sup> Mississippi	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama	RICK LARSEN, Washington
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
DUNCAN HUNTER, California, <i>Vice Chair</i>	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., Georgia
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	SCOTT H. PETERS, California
PAUL COOK, California	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma	GWEN GRAHAM, Florida
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana	SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts
RYAN K. ZINKE, Montana	
STEPHEN KNIGHT, California	
STEVE RUSSELL, <sup>2</sup> Oklahoma	

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Palazzo resigned from the committee on Mar. 24, 2015.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Russell was assigned to the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces on Mar. 24, 2015.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs (including national intelligence space programs), ballistic missile defense, the associated weapons systems sustainment, the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and Department of Energy national security programs.

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama, *Chairman*

TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado, <i>Vice Chair</i>	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	RICK LARSEN, Washington
MO BROOKS, Alabama	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma	MARK TAKAI, <sup>1</sup> Hawaii
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia	BRAD ASHFORD, Nebraska
ROB BISHOP, Utah	PETE AGUILAR, California
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio	
JOHN FLEMING, Louisiana	

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Takai died on July 20, 2016.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON TACTICAL AIR AND LAND FORCES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—All Army, Air Force and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs, strategic missiles, space, lift programs, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology accounts) and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the associated weapons systems sustainment, National Guard and Army, Air Force and Marine Corps Reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
JOHN FLEMING, Louisiana	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., Georgia
PAUL COOK, California, <i>Vice Chair</i>	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana	TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
SAM GRAVES, Missouri	DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey
MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona	RUBEN GALLEGO, Arizona
STEPHEN KNIGHT, California	MARK TAKAI, <sup>1</sup> Hawaii
THOMAS MACARTHUR, New Jersey	GWEN GRAHAM, Florida
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Takai died on July 20, 2016.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee, subject to the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri, *Chairwoman*

JEFF MILLER, Florida	JACKIE SPEIER, California
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr., Georgia
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	GWEN GRAHAM, Florida
MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona	



## COMMITTEE STAFF

By committee resolution adopted at the organizational meeting on January 14, 2015, or by authority of the chairman, the following persons have been appointed to the staff of the committee during the 114th Congress:

Bob Simmons, *Staff Director*  
Jenness Simler, *Deputy Staff Director*  
Catherine McElroy, *General Counsel (resigned December 4, 2015)*  
Andrew Peterson, *General Counsel (appointed January 11, 2016)*  
Betty B. Gray, *Executive Assistant*  
John F. Sullivan, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jesse D. Tolleson, Jr., *Professional Staff Member*  
Paul Arcangeli, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jeanette S. James, *Professional Staff Member*  
Rebecca A. Ross, *Professional Staff Member*  
Heath R. Bope, *Professional Staff Member*  
Lynn M. Williams, *Professional Staff Member (resigned January 8, 2016)*  
John Wason, *Professional Staff Member*  
Cyndi Howard, *Security Manager (resigned August 1, 2016)*  
Douglas Bush, *Professional Staff Member*  
Vickie Plunkett, *Professional Staff Member*  
Kevin Gates, *Professional Staff Member*  
Mike Casey, *Professional Staff Member (resigned January 8, 2016)*  
David Sienicki, *Professional Staff Member*  
Zach Steacy, *Director, Legislative Operations*  
Everett Coleman, *Professional Staff Member*  
Craig Greene, *Professional Staff Member*  
Phil MacNaughton, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jack Schuler, *Professional Staff Member*  
Ryan Crumpler, *Professional Staff Member (resigned October 1, 2015)*  
John N. Johnson, *Staff Assistant*  
William S. Johnson, *Counsel*  
Jaime Cheshire, *Professional Staff Member*  
Peter Villano, *Professional Staff Member*  
Leonor Tomero, *Counsel*  
Jamie Lynch, *Professional Staff Member (resigned January 9, 2015)*  
Michele Pearce, *Counsel (resigned April 7, 2015)*  
Catherine Sendak, *Professional Staff Member*  
Michael Amato, *Professional Staff Member (resigned October 15, 2015)*  
Robert J. McAlister, *Deputy Spokesman (resigned February 5, 2015)*  
Christopher J. Bright, *Professional Staff Member*  
Brian Garrett, *Professional Staff Member*  
Elizabeth Conrad, *Professional Staff Member*  
Andrew T. Walter, *Professional Staff Member*  
Claude Chafin, *Communications Director*  
Aaron Falk, *Clerk (resigned February 12, 2015)*  
Tim Morrison, *Counsel*  
Kimberly Shaw, *Professional Staff Member (resigned April 7, 2015)*  
Stephen Kitay, *Professional Staff Member*  
Katie Thompson, *Security Manager*  
Alexander Gallo, *Professional Staff Member*  
Eric L. Smith, *Clerk (resigned September 7, 2015)*  
Joe Sangiorgio, *Communications Assistant (resigned January 25, 2015)*  
John Noonan, *Deputy Communications Director (resigned April 20, 2015)*  
Colin Bosse, *Research Assistant (resigned November 4, 2016)*  
Julie Herbert, *Clerk (resigned July 24, 2015)*

David Giachetti, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Kari Bingen, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Abigail P. Gage, *Research Assistant (resigned April 14, 2016)*  
 Lindsay Kavanaugh, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Katie Rember, *Clerk (resigned May 29, 2016)*  
 Joe Whited, *Professional Staff Member (resigned April 15, 2016)*  
 Candace Wagner, *Executive Assistant*  
 Michael Miller, *Professional Staff Member (resigned November 30, 2016)*  
 Alison Lynn, *Spokesman and Director of Member Initiatives (appointed January 15, 2015)*  
 Mark Morehouse, *Professional Staff Member (appointed January 15, 2015)*  
 Nick Mikula, *Press Secretary (appointed February 17, 2015)*  
 Michael Tehrani, *Clerk (appointed February 23, 2015, resigned February 22, 2016)*  
 Scott Glabe, *Counsel (appointed April 6, 2015, resigned January 22, 2016)*  
 Craig Collier, *Professional Staff Member (appointed May 7, 2015)*  
 Bruce Johnson, *Professional Staff Member (appointed July 1, 2015)*  
 Daniel Sennott, *Professional Staff Member (appointed July 1, 2015)*  
 Mike Gancio, *Clerk (appointed August 17, 2015)*  
 Nevada Schadler, *Clerk (appointed September 1, 2015)*  
 Andrew Warren, *Professional Staff Member (appointed October 19, 2015)*  
 Margaret Dean, *Professional Staff Member (appointed November 2, 2015)*  
 Jen Stewart, *Professional Staff Member (appointed December 7, 2015, resigned February 15, 2016)*  
 Bob Daigle, *Professional Staff Member (appointed January 4, 2016)*  
 Alexis Lasselle Ross, *Professional Staff Member (appointed January 4, 2016)*  
 Mark Osmack, *Research Assistant (appointed January 4, 2016, resigned June 24, 2016)*  
 Katy Quinn, *Professional Staff Member (appointed February 1, 2016)*  
 Britton Burkett, *Clerk (appointed March 7, 2016)*  
 Barron YoungSmith, *Counsel (appointed April 11, 2016)*  
 Matthew Sullivan, *Counsel (appointed April 12, 2016)*  
 Emily Murphy, *Counsel (appointed May 2, 2016)*  
 Anna Waterfield, *Research Assistant (appointed May 16, 2016)*  
 Jodi Brignola, *Clerk (appointed June 6, 2016)*  
 Brian Greer, *Professional Staff Member (appointed October 3, 2016)*  
 Jason Schmid, *Professional Staff Member (appointed October 3, 2016)*  
 Megan Handal, *Clerk (appointed November 7, 2016)*  
 Andy Schulman, *Professional Staff Member (appointed November 15, 2016)*  
 Danielle Steitz, *Clerk (appointed November 29, 2016)*

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

A total of 285 meetings and hearings have been held by the Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees during the 114th Congress. A breakdown of the meetings and hearings follows:

Full Committee .....	77
Subcommittees:	
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities .....	34
Subcommittee on Military Personnel .....	30
Subcommittee on Readiness .....	27
Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces .....	35
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces .....	42
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces .....	24
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations .....	16

## LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

### PUBLIC LAWS

#### Public Law 114–92 (S. 1356)—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016

S. 1356 was introduced on May 14, 2015, by Senator Ron Johnson. The bill’s title as introduced was, “A bill to clarify that certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 will not take effect until after the Director of the Office of Personnel Management promulgates and makes effective regulations relating to such provisions.” The bill was passed without amendment by unanimous consent in the Senate on May 14, 2015, and was held at the desk in the House.

On May 15, 2015, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, and on June 18, 2015, the Senate passed its version of H.R. 1735. The House and Senate convened a conference committee to reconcile the differences between the two versions of the bill. On September 29, 2015, Chairman Mac Thornberry filed the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735 (H. Rept. 114–270) in the House. On October 1, 2015, the House agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, and on October 7, 2015, the conference report was agreed to in the Senate. On October 22, 2015, H.R. 1735 was vetoed by the President and was returned to the House (H. Doc. 114–70).

On October 28, 2015, the House passed H.R. 1314, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, and on October 30, 2015, the Senate also passed H.R. 1314. The President signed the bill on November 2, 2015. The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–74) did not fund Budget Function 050 to the level requested by the President in the fiscal year 2016 budget submission, and as agreed to by the conferees and authorized in H.R. 1735.

The final version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) was the product of an agreement between the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services on H.R. 1735 to conform to the funding levels in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015. The agreement included a reduction of \$5.1 billion from the level authorized in H.R. 1735. The resulting agreement was brought to the House floor in the form of an amendment to S. 1356. On November 5, 2015, the House suspended the rules and passed S. 1356, as amended, by a vote of 370–58 (Roll no. 618). On November 10, 2015, the Senate agreed to the House amendment to S. 1356 by a vote of 91–3 (Record Vote Number: 301). The President signed the legislation on November 25, 2015, and it became Public Law 114–92.

Public Law 114–92, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, did the following: (1) Authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation; (2) Authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for operation and maintenance and for working capital funds; (3) Authorized for fiscal year 2016: (a) the personnel strength for each Active Duty Component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; and (c) the military training student loads for each of the Active and Reserve Components of the military departments; (4) Modified various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorized appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Energy national security programs; and (8) Authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for the Maritime Administration.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 included the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from the oversight activities of Committee on Armed Services in the previous year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee’s existence.

Public Law 114–149 (S. 719)—A bill to rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center

S. 719, “A bill to rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center” was introduced on March 11, 2015, by Senator Jon Tester, and was referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. On March 16, 2016, the Senate Committee on Armed Services was discharged and the bill was passed in the Senate without amendment by unanimous consent. On March 17, 2016, the bill was received in the House and referred to the House Committee on Armed Services. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel and the full committee waived consideration of S. 719. On April 18, 2016, Mr. Ryan Zinke moved to consider S.

719 under suspension of the rules of the House, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 387–0, 1 present (Roll no. 154). On April 29, 2016, S. 719 was signed by the President and became Public Law 114–149.

#### LEGISLATION VETOED BY THE PRESIDENT

##### H.R. 1735—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016

On April 13, 2015, H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, was introduced by Chairman Mac Thornberry and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On April 29, 2015, the Committee on Armed Services held a markup session to consider H.R. 1735. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered reported H.R. 1735, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 60–2. The bill passed the House, as amended, on May 15, 2015, by recorded vote, 269–151 (Roll no. 239). On May 21, 2015, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice, and placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders Calendar No. 99.

On June 3, 2015, the measure was laid before the Senate by unanimous consent. On June 18, 2015, the Senate then struck all after the enacting clause, inserted the language of a substitute amendment consisting of the Senate passed bill, and then passed H.R. 1735 with an amendment by yeas–nays vote, 71–25 (Record Vote Number: 215). On June 25, 2015, Chairman Thornberry moved that the House disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference, which was agreed to by voice vote. On July 9, 2015, the Senate insisted on the Senate amendment and agreed to the request for conference. On September 29, 2015, the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735 (H. Rept. 114–270) was filed in the House. On October 1, 2015, the conference report was agreed to in the House by the yeas and nays, 270–156 (Roll no. 532). On October 7, 2015, the conference report was agreed to in the Senate, 70–27 (Record Vote Number: 277). On October 22, 2015, H.R. 1735 was vetoed by the President and was returned to the House (H. Doc. 114–70). No further action was taken on H.R. 1735.

For further action on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, please see S. 1356.

#### LEGISLATION PASSED BY BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

##### S. 2943—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017

S. 2943 was reported to the Senate as an original measure by Chairman John McCain on May 18, 2016. The Senate began consideration of S. 2943 on May 23, 2016. It passed the Senate with amendments by yeas–nays vote, 85–13 (Record Vote Number: 98) on June 14, 2016. Two days later, S. 2943 was sent to the House and held at the desk.

On July 7, 2016, consideration of S. 2943 was initiated in the House pursuant to H. Res. 809. The House struck all after the enacting clause in S. 2943 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4909, as passed the House. Pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 809, Mr. Thornberry moved that the House insist upon its

amendment, and requested a conference with the Senate. On July 14, 2016, the Senate disagreed to the House amendment to the Senate bill and agreed to the request for conference by unanimous consent. On November 30, 2016, the conference report to accompany S. 2943 (H. Rept. 114–840) was filed in the House. On December 2, 2016, the conference report was agreed to in the House by the yeas and nays, 375–34 (Roll no. 600). On December 8, 2016, the conference report was agreed to in Senate, 92–7 (Record Vote Number: 159).

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would: (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation; (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for operation and maintenance and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2017: (a) the personnel strength for each Active Duty Component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; and (c) the military training student loads for each of the Active and Reserve Components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Energy national security programs; and (8) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for the Maritime Administration.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally, and over the military application of nuclear energy, to the House Committee on Armed Services. The bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from the oversight activities of Committee on Armed Services in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

#### LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H.R. 3894—To amend title 10, United States Code, to require the prompt notification of State Child Protective Services by military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense required by law to report suspected instances of child abuse and neglect

H.R. 3894, “To amend title 10, United States Code, to require the prompt notification of State Child Protective Services by military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense required by law to report suspected instances of child abuse and neglect” was introduced on November 3, 2015, by Representative Tulsi Gabbard and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The Sub-

committee on Military Personnel and the full committee waived consideration of H.R. 3894. On February 9, 2016, Representative Elise Stefanik moved to consider H.R. 3894 under suspension of the rules of the House, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by voice vote. On February 10, 2016, H.R. 3894 was received in the Senate, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. No further action has been taken on H.R. 3894. However, the conferees included similar legislation in section 574 of S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

#### H.R. 4298—Vietnam Helicopter Crew Memorial Act

H.R. 4298, the Vietnam Helicopter Crew Memorial Act, was introduced on December 18, 2015, by Representative Mark E. Amodei and was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. On September 8, 2016, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on H.R. 4298. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs waived consideration of H.R. 4298, and on December 7, 2016, Representative Joseph J. Heck moved to consider H.R. 4298 under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by voice vote. On December 8, 2016, H.R. 4298 was received in the Senate. No further action has been taken on the bill.

#### H.R. 4909—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017

On April 12, 2016, H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, was introduced by Chairman Mac Thornberry and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On April 27, 2016, the Committee on Armed Services held a markup session to consider H.R. 4909. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered reported H.R. 4909, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 60–2. The bill passed the House, as amended, on May 18, 2016, by recorded vote, 277–147 (Roll no. 216). On May 26, 2016, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice, and placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders Calendar No. 216. For further action on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, please see S. 2943.

#### H.R. 5015—Combat-Injured Veterans Tax Fairness Act of 2016

H.R. 5015, the Combat-Injured Veterans Tax Fairness Act of 2016, was introduced on April 20, 2016, by Representative David Rouzer and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. The Committee on Armed Services waived consideration of H.R. 5015, and on December 5, 2016, Representative Kevin Brady, Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means,

moved to consider H.R. 5015, as amended, under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 392–0 (Roll no. 601). On December 6, 2016, H.R. 5015 was received in the Senate. No further action has been taken on the bill.

H.R. 5351—To prohibit the transfer of any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

H.R. 5351, “To prohibit the transfer of any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba” was introduced on May 26, 2016, by Representative Jackie Walorski and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The committee was discharged from consideration of the bill, and pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 863, H.R. 5351 was considered in the House under a closed rule on September 15, 2016. The resolution included an amendment to the bill printed in part A of the Rules Committee report (H. Rept. 114–744) that was considered as adopted. H. Res. 863 also provided for one hour of debate on H.R. 5351 equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. On September 15, 2016, H.R. 5351 was passed in the House by the yeas and nays, 244–174 (Roll no. 520). H.R. 5351 was received in the Senate on the same day. No further action has been taken.

H.R. 5458—Veterans TRICARE Choice Act

H.R. 5458, the Veterans TRICARE Choice Act, was introduced on June 13, 2016, by Representative Chris Stewart and was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. On June 15, 2016, the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means held a markup session on H.R. 5458 and ordered it reported to the full committee, as amended, by voice vote. On September 8, 2016, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on H.R. 5458. On November 14, 2016, the Committee on Ways and Means reported H.R. 5458, as amended, to the House (H. Rept. 114–809). The Committee on Armed Services waived consideration of H.R. 5458, and was discharged on November 14, 2016. On November 29, 2016, Representative Adrian Smith moved to consider the bill, as amended, under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, was agreed to by voice vote. On November 30, 2016, H.R. 5458 was received in the Senate. No further action has been taken.

## OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

### OVERVIEW

Pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, described below are actions taken and recommendations made with respect to specific areas and subjects that were identified in the oversight plan for special attention during the 114th Congress, as well as additional oversight activities not explicitly enumerated by the oversight plan.

### POLICY ISSUES

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY, NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY, AND RELATED DEFENSE POLICY ISSUES

During the 114th Congress, the committee continued its focus on the readiness, capability, and capacity of the U.S. Armed Forces to defend the Nation's interests, on supporting the authorities and resources necessary for ongoing military operations, and on improving the agility and efficiency of the Department of Defense. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as well as the joint explanatory statements that accompany them, are a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as enumerated in the U.S. Constitution.

The committee recognizes that the current threat environment, as characterized by Dr. Henry Kissinger in January 2015, is “more diverse and complex” that at any point since the end of the Second World War. Terrorism, including the spread of violent extremism by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, instability in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, regional aggression by the Russian Federation, destabilizing actions by the People's Republic of China in the South and East China Seas, developments in nuclear and missile capabilities by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the continued spread of lethal and disruptive technologies, will continue to threaten U.S. national security interests. These events and other security developments across the globe also serve to highlight the continued need for the U.S. military to be postured and ready to defend the Nation's interests and address security challenges, wherever and whenever they may arise.

The committee continued its oversight of: ongoing military operations where U.S. forces are in harm's way, including ongoing global counterterrorism operations; strategic reassurance and deterrence activities in Europe and the Asia-Pacific; and Department of Defense investments in readiness, capabilities, and infrastructure to ensure the U.S. Armed Forces remain capable of addressing cur-

rent and emerging conventional and unconventional challenges. The committee accomplished this oversight through numerous hearings and briefings; engagements with defense leaders, military commanders, diplomats, academics, and private sector experts; and congressional delegation visits to military installations and U.S. forces serving abroad.

The committee also focused on evaluating the Nation's defense and military strategy, including the strategy outlined in the Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review, released in 2014, and the subsequent independent National Defense Panel review, to specifically include evaluating the alignment of the strategy to the security environment and the posture, capabilities, and resources necessary to execute the strategy. The committee also evaluated the risk associated with executing the strategy at current resource levels, particularly the impact that defense cuts and sequestration have on strategy execution.

S. 2943 emphasizes defense strategy reform. It would eliminate the current Quadrennial Defense Review and replace it with a requirement for a top-down driven National Defense Strategy. It would also streamline and classify the National Military Strategy, as well as require a classified National Security Strategy.

#### FORCE PROTECTION

During the 114th Congress, the committee emphasized force protection as a high priority issue for special oversight. The committee particularly focused on areas having a direct impact on the safety of military personnel engaged in the continued operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, as well as the potential for attacks against U.S. troops deployed in support of Operation Inherent Resolve emanating from the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF), Shia militias, forces from the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Russian Federation, and Assad regime forces. The committee also closely monitored the contextual factors that could lead to a change in the force protection posture for U.S. forces.

The committee worked to expedite the promulgation of policies and the fielding of technology and equipment that prevented and/or reduced combat casualties, as well as addressed the urgent operational needs of the global combatant commands in a timely manner.

For all current overseas contingency operations, focus areas included, but were not limited to: the policies for management and acquisition of counter improvised explosive device (IED) equipment throughout the force; persistent surveillance, particularly prevention of IED emplacement; actionable tactical intelligence processing, exploitation, and dissemination capabilities in support of ground operations; effective intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance equipment capabilities; capabilities to counter indirect fire such as artillery and mortar munitions; lighter-weight, properly resourced, and timely fielded quantities of personal protection equipment, to include body armor, night vision equipment, combat helmets, and flame-resistant combat uniforms; vehicle armor, to include survivability improvements to the combat and tactical vehicle fleets; improving current biometric systems; and effective aircraft

survivability equipment (ASE), specifically ASE for the current rotorcraft fleets.

During the 114th Congress, the committee continued to provide robust oversight and monitored “insider attacks” perpetrated by Afghan security forces against U.S. and coalition personnel in Afghanistan. Additionally, the committee continued its oversight of the steps the Department of Defense is taking to understand, protect U.S. troops, and prevent such attacks, to include: the motive of such attacks; the tactics, techniques, and procedures leveraged by the attacker; the impact of the attacks on the mission; and the procedures being taken to mitigate for and, to the maximum extent possible, prevent future “insider attacks.”

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a classified briefing on September 29, 2015, that focused on the global IED threat, to include the proliferation of the explosively formed projectile threat, and ways to mitigate this threat.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) authorized \$438.8 million for the Joint IED Defeat Fund. Public Law 114-92 also required the Secretary of Defense to review the decision to transition the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIDO) to a new combat support agency as part of the Office for the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. Public Law 114-92 authorized an additional \$110.0 million to address an Army unfunded requirement to procure and develop improved countermeasures to better protect deployed AH-64E helicopters against the latest and most lethal threats.

H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, continued the committee’s ongoing activities related to force protection efforts and management of the Joint Improvised Threat Defeat Organization, and provided an additional \$527.1 million for military service rotorcraft and ASE upgrades. S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes several legislative provisions related to force protection, countering IED threats, and the oversight of JIDO including: an extension of authority for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF); and an extension of authority to use JIEDDF for training of foreign security forces to defeat improvised explosive devices. S. 2943 also includes additional oversight requirements to monitor JIDO as it transitions under the Defense Threat Reduction Agency.

#### FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The committee continues to oversee military effectiveness in this era of declining budgets. Reductions to defense resources, to include mechanisms such as sequestration, could affect the quality of the U.S. Armed Forces as the Department of Defense looks to successfully perform its role in the National Security Strategy.

The Comptroller General of the United States has consistently identified the Department of Defense’s financial management as a high-risk area since 1995. The Department’s inability to track and account for billions of dollars in funding and tangible assets continues to undermine its management approach. It also creates a lack of transparency that significantly limits congressional over-

sight. The Department's inability to produce auditable financial statements undermines its efforts to reform defense acquisition processes and to realize efficiencies. Without these objective tools, neither the Department nor Congress can verify that greater value is being created. The committee, therefore, continued to focus on the Department's efforts to implement the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan to correct the weaknesses in its financial statements and to closely monitor the interdependencies between FIAR and the resources being spent on business systems modernization programs that the Department has proposed to address its financial management problems.

The committee received the statutorily mandated semi-annual updates to the FIAR plan in May and November 2015 and 2016. Supporting the Department's goal of achieving audit readiness by the end of 2017, the committee encouraged the Secretary of Defense to address the findings and recommendations identified in the Department's latest FIAR Plan Status Report from November 2015 and to continue improving the Department's audit infrastructure and annual audit regimen.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114-537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee identified that the implementation of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems was a critical element in the military departments' audit readiness plans. Specifically, the Army General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS) supported standardized Army financial management and accounting practices, the Navy Enterprise Resource Planning (Navy ERP) system standardized Navy financial management, and the Air Force Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System (DEAMS) provided a range of financial management capabilities for the Air Force.

The committee noted that the successful implementation, operation, and full utilization of GFEBS, Navy ERP, and DEAMS were critical to the military departments' ability to produce auditable statements and pass financial audits. The committee therefore encouraged the Army, Navy, and Air Force to ensure that full implementation, operation, and utilization of their respective ERP systems remain on schedule. The Department's Functional Management Office (FMO) is responsible for ensuring these ERP systems allow the end user to produce auditable, timely, and accurate reporting of all financial data. To fulfill the FMO's requirements and to ensure that GFEBS, Navy ERP, and DEAMS meet auditing standards, the committee noted that the Department should leverage greater certified public accountant expertise and Federal financial management experience. In that regard, the committee stated that this expertise and experience should be included in any follow-on award of a contract for implementation of, or enhancement to, GFEBS, Navy ERP, and DEAMS, to better ensure ERP system success, compliance with all laws and regulations, and to meet the functional needs of the financial user community.

#### U.S. MILITARY EFFORT IN AFGHANISTAN

The U.S. military effort in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan continues in three parts: training, advising, and assisting the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces; conducting counterter-

rorism operations against Al Qaeda and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant—Khorasan Province; and executing force protection of U.S. personnel and facilities.

The committee has conducted robust oversight of Operation Resolute Support, including the resourcing of the mission. The committee is continuing to examine the stability of the regional security environment and efforts to deny safe haven to Al Qaeda, the Haqqani Network, and other terrorist organizations.

The committee has held multiple hearings and briefings on U.S. policy and operations in Afghanistan. Also, the committee has conducted member and staff travel to Afghanistan and the region to gain additional insight into these issues.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee fully funded and provided all necessary authorities to support the mission in Afghanistan.

#### OPERATION INHERENT RESOLVE

The U.S. and coalition forces continue to conduct operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), known as Operation Inherent Resolve. As of December 2016, operations are underway to re-take Mosul, in the Republic of Iraq, from ISIL and to isolate the city of Raqqa, in the Syrian Arab Republic, which is an ISIL stronghold.

The committee has conducted oversight of these efforts, including the application of resources, the effectiveness of the campaign, and the stability plans following the military campaign. The committee has held hearings and briefings on the coalition military campaign, as well as the political and sectarian dynamics in both Iraq and Syria that have in part fostered the context and political climate for ISIL to expand and grow. Additionally, the committee has sought expert views and analysis from leading academics, retired military officials, and former diplomats. Further, the committee has regularly conducted travel to Iraq and the region to monitor the operations and gain insights from allies and partners.

Additionally, the committee has monitored the stability of the countries in the region of Iraq and Syria as well as the U.S. effort to prevent the expansion of ISIL in the region.

The committee also has focused on the efforts to train and equip the Iraqi Security Forces and the vetted elements of the moderate Syrian opposition. The committee will continue to examine and take legislative action to refine these efforts so that they are successful and support the overall mission and U.S. interests.

Finally, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee provided full funding and all necessary authorities to support the missions in Iraq and Syria.

#### *Authorization for Use of Military Force*

The committee examined the President's military actions against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), including the legal underpinnings of such actions. To date, the President has cited the

Article II authority under the U.S. Constitution as well as the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40) and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243) as the legal basis for U.S. military operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic.

The committee has studied Public Law 107–40 and Public Law 107–243, including a hearing in February 2016, with outside experts, to inform consideration of any new authorization for the use of military force (AUMF) against ISIL, including lessons learned from the implementation of Public Law 107–40 and Public Law 107–243 and how those AUMFs comport with the evolving nature of the threat.

#### THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST

The Greater Middle East remained an area of focus for committee oversight in the 114th Congress. This geographic area includes countries in which the United States has invested, and continues to invest, significant military resources.

Al Qaeda, its affiliates, its associated organizations, and other terrorist organizations continue to leverage safehavens in certain countries within this region to conduct operational planning and to serve as launch points for attacks against the United States, its allies and partners, and U.S. interests. As a result, the committee conducted oversight of U.S. defense policies, readiness, and military programs in this region through congressional travel, multiple hearings and classified briefings, and engagements with outside experts.

#### *Islamic Republic of Pakistan*

The committee continued to conduct oversight on the broad range of security issues involving the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and, given the critical U.S. military effort in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, carefully reviewed the use of Coalition Support Funds (CSF), which are provided to reimburse Pakistan for its support to U.S. military operations, and security assistance to Pakistan.

The committee monitored the security and stability of Pakistan, including the security of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons, Pakistan’s on-going and future nuclear weapon projects, and its willingness and operational capacity to combat key terrorist groups, such as Al Qaeda, the Afghan and Pakistan Taliban, the Haqqani network, and other terrorist organizations. Moreover, the committee evaluated the terrorist activity emanating from the border area between Pakistan and Afghanistan and conducted oversight of the Department of Defense’s efforts to combat the threat.

The committee took steps to update CSF authorization in S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. Specifically, the CSF was revised to include additional activities for reimbursement in support of Pakistan’s counterterrorism and internal security challenges. The committee maintained limitations on CSF to Pakistan and will continue to carefully scrutinize reimbursements to Pakistan in accordance with the law.

### *Republic of Iraq*

The U.S. military posture, strategy, and approach has changed significantly within the Republic of Iraq. The on-going U.S. military campaign against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and the effort to re-train and re-build the Iraqi Security Forces are the key efforts that has been the focus of committee oversight in the 114th Congress.

Other areas of oversight focus within the U.S. military campaign in Iraq included the employment of U.S. military forces, the effectiveness of the air campaign, and the robustness of enabler support. The committee also has closely monitored the political situation in Iraq.

The committee held several hearings and received numerous briefings on Iraq, ranging from intelligence and operational updates, to policy and strategy reviews with Department of Defense officials and outside experts.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee provided authorization and full funding for the Iraq Train and Equip Fund. Additionally, the committee re-authorized the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and provided other authorities for the commander such as the Commanders' Emergency Response Program for ex gratia payments.

### *Islamic Republic of Iran*

The committee conducted oversight of U.S. national security policy and strategy with respect to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, placing particular emphasis on Iran's nuclear program and capabilities. During the 114th Congress, the committee also monitored the threat posed by Iran's ballistic missile capabilities, its malign activities in the region, and its support to proxy terrorist organizations and militias, such as Lebanese Hezbollah and Iraqi Shia militias.

The committee has conducted oversight of the implementation of the Comprehensive Joint Plan of Action (CJPOA) between the P5+1 (the United States of America, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic, and the Federal Republic of Germany) and Iran, including Iran's fulfillment of its commitments under the CJPOA.

Finally, the committee continued to monitor the strategic orientation, operational capacity, and goals of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps. The committee also focused its attention towards Iran's Quds Force, including the activities of the Quds Force in the Syrian Arab Republic, the Republic of Iraq, and the region.

In both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee took steps to review U.S. military posture within the Arabian Gulf region and to understand Iran's use of commercial entities for illicit military activities.

### *Syrian Arab Republic*

The committee conducted oversight into the evolving security and humanitarian situation inside the Syrian Arab Republic, as well as the effects of the on-going conflict on its neighbors, including the Republic of Turkey, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Republic of Iraq, and the Lebanese Republic. Additionally, the committee monitored the U.S. and coalition military operations in Syria against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) as part of Operation Inherent Resolve.

The committee held several hearings and received numerous briefings on Syria, ranging from intelligence and operational updates to policy and strategy reviews with Department of Defense officials and outside experts.

The committee reviewed the U.S. policy and approach against the Assad regime. Further, the committee focused on the movement of fighters to and from Syria, including the capacity and relative strength of ISIL and other terrorist groups acting in Syria.

Finally, the committee conducted oversight of the effort to train and equip the moderate elements of the vetted Syrian opposition and the deployment and positioning of military personnel and resources to the region to address this issue set. In both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee re-authorized the Syria Train and Equip program. The committee maintained the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to reprogram monies for this program in order to maintain close congressional oversight of this effort.

### *Republic of Yemen*

The security situation in the Republic of Yemen was a significant focus for the committee. The committee maintained its oversight of the U.S. military's counterterrorism activities in Yemen, the United States' support to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and the status of coalition efforts to counter Houthi rebels in Yemen.

The committee also monitored the capability, capacity, and strategy of Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) to conduct transnational terrorist attacks and the associated U.S. counterterrorism efforts against AQAP.

The committee conducted congressional travel to the region and engaged with allies and partners in the region to gain more clarity into the regional dynamics and coalition effort in Yemen.

## GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

Since the 9/11 attacks, the United States has dealt Al Qaeda repeated and significant blows during the global war on terrorism. Despite many notable successes, Al Qaeda, as well as its adherents and affiliates, remains active in areas of importance to the United States, including: the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; the Islamic Republic of Pakistan; the Islamic Republic of Iraq; the Federal Republic of Somalia; and the Republic of Yemen. The committee continued to conduct oversight, often in classified form, over terrorism issues, with particular attention to special operations capabilities, and the changing nature of Al Qaeda's organization, affiliates, and

its operations, as well as threats being posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). The committee continued to focus on efforts to build partner nation counterterrorism and conventional warfare capabilities to counter these threats at the regional and local level. As the United States strengthened and built partnership capacity with key allies around the globe, the committee remained focused on the Department of Defense's efforts to aggressively fight the global war on terror and counter radicalism in places of concern, such as Pakistan, Yemen, the Horn of Africa, North Africa, and threats posed by groups such as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant. Ensuring security and stability in volatile regions that cannot adequately govern themselves or secure their own territory remained a top priority for the committee.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held several related hearings in this area including: a hearing on March 18, 2015, "Special Operations Forces in an Uncertain Threat Environment: A Review of the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Command"; a hearing on March 25, 2015, "Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (CWMD) Strategy and the Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and Chemical Biological Defense Program"; a hearing on June 24, 2015, "The Counterterrorism Strategy Against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL): Are We on the Right Path?"; a hearing on March 1, 2016, "Outside Views on Special Operations Forces in an Evolving Threat Environment as a Review of the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Command"; and a joint hearing on June 9, 2016, with the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, "Stopping the Money Flow: The War on Terror Finance."

Similarly, the committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held several classified and/or closed briefings and roundtables including: a roundtable on February 5, 2015, "Understanding Today's Challenges and Tomorrow's Threats to U.S. National Security"; a briefing on February 26, 2015, "Quarterly Update on Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence"; a briefing on June 17, 2015, "Quarterly Update on Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence"; a roundtable on September 10, 2015, "A Roundtable Discussion on Iranian Irregular Warfare Threats"; a briefing on October 8, 2015, "Quarterly Update on Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence"; a briefing on January 8, 2016, "Understanding and Preventing Emerging 21st Century Threats"; a briefing on May 26, 2016, "Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence"; a joint briefing on July 12, 2016, with the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, "Department of Defense Human Intelligence Capabilities—The Defense Clandestine Service: Organizational History and Proposed Changes"; and a briefing on November 30, 2016, "Update on Cyber Operations Support to Counterterrorism." The committee continued additional classified oversight functions on a recurring basis, including issue-driven updates via secure communications with senior Department of Defense officials on current activities, most notably in cyber and global counterterrorism operations. Committee members and staff

also conducted oversight by traveling overseas on congressional delegations and staff delegations to the United Arab Emirates, the Republic of Turkey, the State of Kuwait, Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia, the Republic of Kenya, the Republic of Djibouti, the Republic of Niger, the Kingdom of Morocco, the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included several legislative provisions related to the global war on terrorism, counterterrorism, special operations forces, and sensitive activities. These included: a section that would make permanent the authority for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or government personnel of allied forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. Armed Forces conducted outside the United States against international terrorism or providing such information or assistance that is beneficial to force protection associated with such an operation; a section that would increase from \$75.0 million to \$85.0 million the authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism pursuant to section 1208 of the Ronald Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375); a section that would extend by 1 year, the authority for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities for conventional and special operations forces pursuant to subsection (h) of section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81); a briefing on the shallow water combat submersible program; a modification to congressional notification procedures of sensitive military operations; congressional notification requirements related to facilities for intelligence collection or for special operations abroad; prohibition on use of funds for retirement of helicopter sea combat squadron 84 and 85 aircraft; the establishment of an Interagency Hostage Recovery Coordinator; a requirement for a Department of Defense strategy for countering unconventional warfare; and modification for Department of Defense capabilities to respond to situations involving bombings of places of public use, Government facilities, public transportation systems, and infrastructure facilities.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes several legislative provisions related to the use of force in counterterrorism operations and the global war on terrorism including: an increase in frequency of defense committee counterterrorism operations briefings from quarterly to monthly; modifications to section 130f of title 10, United States Code, congressional notification of sensitive military operations, to strengthen oversight and notification requirements; an extension and modification of authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism; modification of the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship program; an extension and modification of authority for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities; changes to the Department of Defense for management of special operations forces and special operations; and a modification and extension of author-

ity to provide assistance to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

#### AFRICA

The committee conducted regular oversight on Department of Defense activities in Africa. The committee continued to examine the Department's coordination within the interagency to address the range of activities that are occurring in Africa. The committee devoted particular attention to the Department's implementation of the global train and equip authority codified in the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) and the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund (CTPF) authorized by Public Law 113–291. As the Department's reliance on training and equipping African partners to provide regional security has increased, the committee focused on the Department's execution of train and equip programs, the development of defense institutions in African nations, and the ability of African partner nations to absorb and sustain the assistance provided. The committee's oversight of the Department's programs and activities in Africa contributed to the committee's measures to reform security cooperation authorities, as described elsewhere in this report.

The committee focused its oversight on the broad range of security challenges across the African continent, including the tenuous security situation in Libya and violence from terrorist organizations and their affiliates such as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in North Africa, Boko Haram in the Lake Chad region, Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb in the western Sahel, and Al Shabaab in the Horn of Africa. S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would require the Department of Defense to submit a comprehensive strategy for U.S. defense interests in Africa to enable the Department to address and plan for these challenges. The committee held a hearing and conducted discussions with outside experts on Islamic extremism in January and February 2015, and received numerous staff-level briefings on security threats throughout the continent.

Specifically to North Africa, the committee received Member- and staff-level briefings on the threat of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, which presents a significant threat to the region, particularly in Libya. The Joint Explanatory Statement to Accompany S. 1356, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Committee Print No. 2) noted the importance of a secure and stable Tunisian Republic to counter the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and other terrorist organizations in North Africa and encouraged the provision of U.S. assistance to Tunisia. Additionally, the committee conducted oversight on the Department of Defense's implementation of the lessons learned from the 2012 terrorist attack in Benghazi, including, but not limited to, interagency coordination, positioning of military assets, threat perception, threat analysis, intelligence sharing, operational coordination, and crisis response in the "new normal" operational environment.

With respect to East Africa, the committee received numerous staff-level briefings on military operations in the Federal Republic

of Somalia to counter the threat from Al Shabaab, particularly given the increased resources devoted to the development of Somali security forces. The committee remained focused on the threat from Al Shabaab, as well as the steps that the Department is taking to counter this group and prevent transnational terrorist attacks on the United States, its allies and partners, and its interests. Moreover, the committee continued to monitor the overlapping ideological, strategic, and operational coordination between Horn of Africa terrorist groups, such as Al Shabaab, and terrorist groups on the Arabian Peninsula, such as Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.

The committee continued its oversight of threats in West Africa. The committee paid particular attention to the continuing ideological, strategic, and operational evolution of Boko Haram and Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb. The Joint Explanatory Statement to Accompany S. 1356, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Committee Print No. 2) required the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to submit a report on the threat of Boko Haram and the efforts taken to counter this threat. Additionally, the committee maintained its oversight of Operation United Assistance until its conclusion in May 2015, receiving regular briefs on the status of the operation, safety measures, and the transition of the Department of Defense's mission to other Government agencies.

In Central Africa, the committee continued its oversight of the Department of Defense's activities to support the Uganda Peoples' Defense Force and other national militaries to counter the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) and apprehend or remove Joseph Kony. The committee received multiple staff-level briefings on the transition of the counter-LRA effort, as required in the committee report (H. Rept. 114-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

#### EUROPE

In the past two years, there has been a shift in U.S. security and foreign policy towards Europe. In 2016, the Secretary of Defense characterized Russia as the number one strategic threat. European security has also been shaped by continued threats from terrorism, including from returning foreign fighters currently in the Republic of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic fighting for the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and a refugee crisis of immigrants fleeing violence in the Middle East and Africa.

The committee's primary emphasis in this area has been to oversee the U.S. military policy and strategy, programs, and resources necessary to effectively deter and defend against Russian aggression. As the committee learned in multiple hearings and briefings, and from visits to military installations and training facilities, there is a recognition among the military services that, after 15 years focused on counterterrorism operations in the greater Middle East, the readiness of the U.S. Armed Forces vis-a-vis a near-peer challenger has eroded.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, increase resources for the European Reassurance Initiative, which includes funding the deployment of

a rotational Army Brigade Combat Team to increase U.S. military presence in Europe, preposition equipment, training and exercises, and intelligence capabilities.

The committee also continues to monitor contributions that North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries provide to regional and global security, including the deployment of approximately 3,000 personnel to the NATO-led Operation Resolute Support mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and how those contributions complement U.S. forces and capabilities. In particular, the committee continues to monitor the outcomes announced at NATO's 2014 Wales and 2016 Warsaw summits, and how such outcomes will be implemented with available resources.

#### *Russian Federation*

The Russian Federation continues to maintain an assertive foreign policy, particularly evident in Ukraine and the Syrian Arab Republic. Russian military activity, and its employment of unconventional and conventional warfare tactics, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe and in Syria, was a primary area of concern for the committee in the 114th Congress. After 15 years primarily focused on counterterrorism operations in the greater Middle East, the committee recognized that a greater emphasis addressing near-peer capabilities and deterrence was necessary. Thus, the committee's oversight has focused on the U.S. military capabilities, capacity, posture, and readiness needed to effectively counter and deter Russia.

The Department of Defense's European Reassurance Initiative, and the resources associated with it, was a significant area of oversight for the committee. The committee sought to ensure that the increased resources were being effectively applied against valid requirements. The committee also maintained oversight of Department of Defense resources and tools allocated to building the capacity of Ukraine and other NATO allies and partners to deter and defend against further Russian aggression.

During the 114th Congress, the committee received several intelligence briefings on Russia's military modernization programs, its combat actions and objectives in Syria, and its continued aggression in Ukraine. The committee held hearings on February 25, 2015, and February 25, 2016, with the commander of U.S. European Command, to inform its deliberations on the fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017 national defense authorization acts, respectively. The committee also held a hearing on February 10, 2016, with outside experts, to examine Russian motives and strategies and its implications for U.S. policy and strategy, entitled "Understanding and Deterring Russia: U.S. Policies and Strategies." Additionally, for the first time in recent years, the committee participated in a Defense Intelligence Agency-led senior leader seminar to examine the complex challenges associated with Russia.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) contained several provisions to bolster the deterrence and defense capabilities of the United States and its allies and partners in Europe, to include authorizing \$789.0 million for the European Reassurance Initiative, \$300.0 million for security assistance, equipment, and training to Ukrainian forces, and addi-

tional types of training for Eastern European partners. Public Law 114–92 also limited military cooperation between the United States and Russia, and required the Department to examine U.S. troop levels and the posturing of defense materiel in Europe.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, continued, and in some cases enhanced, many of the provisions from fiscal year 2016. These include authorizing an increase in funds for the renamed European Deterrence Initiative, \$350.0 million for security assistance, equipment, and training to Ukraine, and an increase in U.S. military presence and prepositioned equipment in Europe.

#### ASIA

The committee continued to oversee the Department of Defense’s implementation of the U.S. policy to “rebalance” to the Asia-Pacific region. In particular, the committee monitored the Department’s strategy, force posture, capability needs, and readiness in the region to ensure that U.S. forces are properly resourced and postured to protect U.S. national security interests.

The People’s Republic of China continues its unilateral efforts to assert regional influence, particularly in the South and East China Seas, while also continuing to modernize its military. The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea continues to advance its nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities, and in 2016 alone, has significantly increased its volume of missile tests and conducted two nuclear tests. The committee monitored these and other emerging developments to inform its views and actions to shape U.S. national security policy, strategy, and defense investments for the region.

These security challenges have led the United States to strengthen its relationships with traditional treaty allies while also forging new relationships, particularly with partners in Southeast Asia. The committee continued to closely oversee the Department of Defense’s efforts to implement a range of posture, force structure, and engagement initiatives in the region, including rotational deployments of Marines, naval, and air assets; forward pre-positioning; infrastructure realignments; training and exercises; and security cooperation programs.

During the 114th Congress, the committee received intelligence briefings on China’s military modernization programs and its island construction and military-related activities in the South China Sea, as well as on North Korea’s nuclear and missile developments. The committee also engaged with defense and economic experts from the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission regarding their annual report to Congress.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, authorizes the South China Sea Initiative to increase maritime security and maritime domain awareness of foreign countries along the South China Sea. In S. 2943, the committee supported senior military exchanges between the United States and Taiwan, authorizes an annual report on U.S. Freedom of Navigation Operations (FONOPs), authorizes additional reporting requirements in the China Military Power Report on the order of battle of the People’s Liberation Army and Chinese military activities in the South

China Sea, and authorizes funding for the Southeast Asia Maritime Security Initiative.

#### CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

The committee continued to oversee the programs and policies of the Department of Defense related to Central and South America. In particular, the committee maintained oversight of programs relating to the Republic of Colombia and the Northern Triangle of Central America, including the Republic of Honduras, the Republic of Guatemala and the Republic of El Salvador. The committee paid particular attention to how violence related to transnational organized crime affected security and stability in the region.

The committee hosted discussions with U.S. military commanders and foreign ambassadors to better understand the regional security environment, the budget and priorities of U.S. Southern Command, and key regional developments such as the peace process in Colombia.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included several provisions that would reauthorize Department of Defense counternarcotics authorities for Colombia, authorize additional funding for defense programs in Central America, and authorize additional funding for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance for U.S. Southern Command.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes several provisions that would reauthorize Department of Defense counternarcotics authorities for Colombia and provides funding to address the de-mining initiative in Colombia.

#### SECURITY COOPERATION

Throughout the 114th Congress, the committee paid significant attention to the Department of Defense efforts in building partner capacity (BPC) and security cooperation. The committee's focus on these activities led to comprehensive reform of the authorities, funding, programs, and oversight of security cooperation.

The committee conducted “BPC Week” from October 20 to October 22, 2015, which included a “Security Cooperation 101” roundtable led by the Congressional Research Service, an open committee hearing with outside witnesses, and a closed, classified committee briefing with Administration officials. Additionally, the committee received numerous staff-level briefings. The committee continued to monitor and assess the execution of BPC authorities, both during the initial congressional notification process and while those programs were in progress. The committee also conducted oversight of the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund allocations toward BPC activities.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included numerous provisions addressing the committee's concerns about BPC. Public Law 114–92 required the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to develop and issue to the Department of Defense a strategic framework for Department of Defense security cooperation to guide prioritization of resources and activities. Public Law 114–92 extended for 1 year the funding limitations for the existing train and equip authority (formerly referred to as “section 1206”), modified

the National Guard State Partnership Program, extended the authority for non-reciprocal exchanges of defense personnel between the United States and foreign countries, authorized the Secretary of Defense to provide training and support to personnel of foreign ministries of defense, and required the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to provide semi-annual reports to Congress on the military intelligence training of foreign personnel.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would further reform security cooperation by: creating a new security cooperation chapter in United States Code to combine and codify numerous authorities and funding sources; consolidating and simplifying multiple, disparate authorities; combining numerous existing authorities to train and equip security forces of foreign countries into one consolidated authority; requiring an annual consolidated budget for security cooperation programs and activities; rationalizing the coordination between the Department of Defense and the Department of State, including joint development and planning to ensure security cooperation programs align with foreign policy objectives; requiring the Department of Defense develop a program of assessment, monitoring, and evaluation to improve security cooperation program outcomes; consolidating congressional notification and reporting requirements to improve oversight and transparency; requiring rigorous standards to improve the quality of the security cooperation workforce while improving career progression opportunities; and mandating a quadrennial review of security sector assistance programs and authorities and an independent assessment of the Department's security cooperation programs. Additionally, S. 2943 would increase the obligation authority of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund to \$2.5 billion, while requiring that \$500.0 million of the fund may only be used for precision guided munitions that may be required by partner and allied forces to enhance the effectiveness of their contribution to overseas contingency operations conducted or supported by the United States. The committee will continue to conduct oversight of security cooperation programs and funding to ensure the Department of Defense appropriately institutes the reforms included in S. 2943.

Related to BPC and security cooperation, the committee also conducted oversight of the parts of the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program that are executed by the Department of Defense. As discussed elsewhere in this report, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held hearings on FMS on May 11, 2016, and May 17, 2016, and conducted a Member-level briefing on April 20, 2016. As required by the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization act for Fiscal Year 2016, and by the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the Department of Defense provided two briefings to committee staff on improvements to the FMS process. Additionally, the committee received numerous other staff-level briefings on the FMS program. S. 2943 would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations to require the use of firm fixed-price contracts for foreign military sales and would require that contracts in support of FMS cases meet a 180-day definitization requirement.

## INTELLIGENCE

In the 114th Congress, the committee continued to monitor the reorganization of the Intelligence Community through implementation of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–458) and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence position authorized by the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). The committee held hearings and briefings to examine resource allocation for intelligence-related programs for effectiveness and affordability; defense intelligence strategies and policies in consideration of current and anticipated future threats; organization and management of the elements of the Department of Defense that are part of the Intelligence Community; and the consideration and prioritization of defense intelligence requirements across the Intelligence Community. These included hearings and briefings on “The Present and Future State of Defense Intelligence,” “World Wide Threats,” “The Defense Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Enterprise,” “The Intelligence Community’s Use of Social Media,” and “Counterintelligence: The Enemy is Watching and Listening,” along with other current intelligence and programmatic updates.

Additionally, the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted several classified member briefings covering intelligence support to counterterrorism, counterproliferation, and cyber operations, as well as intelligence support for science and technology investments.

## DETAINEE POLICY, MILITARY COMMISSIONS, AND RELATED MATTERS

The committee continued its oversight of detainee policy, including detainees held in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (GTMO).

With respect to detainees held in Afghanistan, the committee continued to focus on the intelligence provided by the Government of Afghanistan from detainees under their control and the implications for U.S. intelligence and operations associated with the current U.S. policy to not detain combatants in Afghanistan.

With respect to detainees held at GTMO, the committee continued to monitor transfer and release policies and practices, as well as the use of the Military Commissions Act (Public Law 109–366; Public Law 111–84) that established the current legal framework governing the operation of military tribunals to try detainees for war crimes and codified some of the procedural rights of GTMO detainees. The chairwoman of the Subcommittee for Oversight and Investigation led a congressional delegation of five other committee Members to GTMO in February 2015, to observe the detention operations first-hand and to be briefed on the detention facility’s operations. Furthermore, the committee received Member-level GTMO transfer updates on February 12, 2015, March 24, 2015, April 14, 2015, June 11, 2015, June 8, 2016, and September 15, 2016, in addition to numerous staff-level briefings on transfers of GTMO detainees. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) reenacted and modified certain prior requirements relating to the transfer of GTMO detainees to foreign countries; required the Secretary of Defense to submit a re-

port setting forth the details of a comprehensive strategy for the detention of current and future individuals captured and held pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40); prohibited the use of fiscal year 2016 funds made available to the Department of Defense for the realignment of forces at or closure of GTMO; and prohibited until December 31, 2016, the transfer of GTMO detainees to the United States, the construction or modification of facilities in the United States to house GTMO detainees, and the transfer of GTMO detainees to Libya, the Federal Republic of Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, and the Republic of Yemen. Public Law 114–92 also required new reports on current GTMO detainees determined to be high or medium risk, on contact between terrorists and former GTMO detainees, about recidivism of former GTMO detainees, on terms of written agreements with foreign countries regarding transfers of GTMO detainees, and on the use of GTMO and other Department of Defense or Bureau of Prisons prisons or detention or disciplinary facilities in recruitment or other propaganda of terrorist organizations. S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would extend until December 31, 2017, the prohibitions on transfer of GTMO detainees to the United States, the construction or modification of facilities in the United States to house GTMO detainees, and the transfer of GTMO detainees to Libya, the Federal Republic of Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, and the Republic of Yemen.

#### *Taliban Five Transfer*

As described elsewhere in this report, the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations issued a report on the inquiry into the Department of Defense’s May 2014 transfer to the State of Qatar of five law-of-war detainees in connection with the recovery of a captive U.S. Army sergeant. The report included dissenting views of the ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

This work was the continuation of activities directed to be undertaken in 2014 by the previous chairman of the committee. The mandated task was to inquire into the rationale for the transfer, the process by which the transfer decision was made, the national security implications of the transfer, and related topics. In the course of the investigation, the committee conducted transcribed interviews of 16 Department officials involved in or knowledgeable of the transfer and related events. The subcommittee also received more than 4,000 pages of classified and unclassified documents from the Department of Defense and other agencies, reviewed classified video footage, conducted a staff oversight trip to Qatar, and facilitated two congressional delegations to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

#### NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

During the 114th Congress, the committee reviewed the recommendations of the National Commission on the Future of the Army to allow for an independent review of the roles, missions and balance of the Reserve Component and Active Component of the

Army for the future. Given the uncertainty of the current and projected fiscal environment, the availability of equipment needed to sustain and modernize the National Guard and Reserve Components as an operational Reserve and for their domestic support missions, to include legacy aircraft as part of the Aerospace Control Alert mission, remains a concern. The committee also focused oversight efforts on current equipment investment strategies for the National Guard and Reserve Components with particular emphasis on affordability and modernization of critical dual-use equipment platforms that are essential to the National Guard's title 32 mission, defense support to civil authorities. Furthermore, the committee continued to monitor and evaluate the obligation and execution rates of funds provided as part of a separate procurement account, entitled the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account, which would be used to address equipment shortfalls for the National Guard and Reserve Components.

#### JOINT TASK FORCE ON U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

On December 11, 2015, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services designated Representative Brad Wenstrup of Ohio to serve as his representative on a three-member Joint Task Force charged with investigating allegations that intelligence analysis had been improperly manipulated in 2014 and early 2015 at U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM). The Joint Task Force's other members were a majority party member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the House Committee on Appropriations and a majority party member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Majority staff of the Committee on Armed Services assisted Representative Wenstrup in his assignment. Representative Wenstrup and/or majority staff conducted 15 transcribed interviews (totaling almost 1,500 pages and nearly 40 hours) of relevant uniformed and civilian personnel of varying grades or rank at CENTCOM. One congressional delegation and one staff delegation were also undertaken to CENTCOM headquarters to gather information, and the Joint Task Force members and/or staff reviewed more than 2,000 pages of documents produced by the Department of Defense. On August 10, 2016, the Joint Task Force released a 17-page report of its work to date entitled "Initial Findings of the House of Representatives Joint Task Force on U.S. Central Command Intelligence Analysis."

#### DEFENSE REFORM

##### OVERVIEW

In the 114th Congress, the committee prioritized defense reform to create greater agility, accountability, and responsiveness within the Department of Defense, and to get more value for the tax payer dollar. The committee's reform efforts were focused in four principal areas: acquisition; compensation and benefits (including healthcare and commissaries); Uniform Code of Military Justice; and personnel, organization and management.

In these areas, the committee conducted numerous hearings and briefings; held discussions with experts from across defense, academia, and the private sector; traveled to military installations, in-

dustry facilities, and other relevant sites; and conducted its own independent research and analysis to inform major legislative reform packages carried in both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

#### ACQUISITION ISSUES

##### *The Acquisition System and Acquisition Policy*

The committee continued its ongoing effort to improve the agility of the Department of Defense acquisition system and the environment (i.e., human resources, culture, statutes, regulations, and processes) driving acquisition choices in the Department, industry, and Congress. In undertaking this effort, the committee solicited input from industry, academia, the Department, and others during the 113th Congress, and continued to engage these stakeholders during the 114th Congress. The committee also continued with a series of hearings, briefings, and roundtable discussions in the 114th Congress to receive testimony from key acquisition leaders and experts.

The committee remains concerned that the Department’s conventional acquisition system is not sufficiently agile to support warfighter demands. On average, major defense acquisition programs operate for 9 years before yielding new capabilities. Requirements determination, budgeting, and contracting can each take another 2 years or more before programs begin. Meanwhile, technological change has been rapidly generating new, and often unforeseeable, innovations. Global threats are evolving even more quickly, with adversaries leveraging new technologies to exploit gaps in our military capabilities. The conventional acquisition system simply does not enable capabilities to be delivered to warfighters fast enough. The committee has concluded that the current acquisition system costs too much, takes too long, and the troops simply do not get enough out of it.

The committee notes that this persistent lack of agility derives in part from the basic incentives embedded in the requirements, acquisition, budget, and oversight processes. Weapon system requirements must be set anticipating technology that will be available after years of development, so requirements are naturally optimistic. Optimism carries with it substantial technical risk, which leads the acquisition system to make short-term, cost-savings decisions that reduce flexibility and increase long-term costs. Budget timelines and oversight committees require the military services to provide detailed budget justifications, even though such details then limit the services’ ability to pursue new technological innovations after funds are appropriated. Then in response to acquisition shortcomings, both Congress and the Department have imposed new layers of bureaucratic management and special authorities to circumvent the conventional acquisition process.

While the committee recognizes that there are no “silver bullet” reform packages that can immediately fix the current acquisition system in a holistic manner, the committee built on initial reforms included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), by incorporating several provisions in S.

2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, aimed at addressing many of the identified shortcomings. Of note, S. 2943 includes provisions that would:

(1) Require modular open systems approaches (MOSA) for new weapon systems after January 1, 2019. MOSA creates opportunities for more rapid updates of components, insertion of new technology, and responses to emerging threats.

(2) Authorize new budgetary flexibility for military services to experiment with new technology and prototype weapon system components, while providing \$225.0 million to the military departments in the Rapid Prototyping Fund and excluding associated prototyping projects from major defense acquisition program cost baselines. Experimentation is consistent with best practice and avoids years of requirements and budgeting process. Service prototyping boards and congressional reporting would enable effective oversight.

(3) Require the Secretary of Defense to establish cost and schedule targets at program initiation, and requires technology to be developed in major defense acquisition programs only if such development will not delay the program.

(4) Delegate additional acquisition program management to the senior acquisition executives of the military departments, rather than the Office of the Secretary of Defense, while further reinforcing the role and responsibilities of the military service chiefs in identifying performance requirements (including tradeoffs between cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance) of major defense acquisition programs.

(5) Refocus the Joint Requirements Oversight Council on identifying capability gaps, validating that proposed weapon systems fulfill capability gaps, and approving only truly joint performance requirements, such as interoperability.

(6) Establish an “Acquisition Scorecard” that pulls exclusively from existing reports to provide departmental and congressional leadership with key decision metrics from both program offices and from independent assessors. Improvements in transparency will strengthen risk management and oversight of major defense acquisition programs and addresses concerns of a lack of awareness of risk and weaknesses in risk management.

(7) Direct the establishment of an enterprise data system for acquisition program cost data, expands the scope of programs on which cost data is collected, and standardizes cost data to facilitate analysis.

(8) Align intellectual property rights to MOSA and rebalance those rights to ensure the Government maintains access to needed technical data while encouraging companies to do business with the Department.

#### *Defense Industrial Base and Technology Transfers*

The committee continued examination of the health, security, competitiveness, and innovative capacity of the defense industrial base. The committee recognizes that the industrial base for complex major weapons systems and other services has become more fragile, with both large contractors consolidating and small contractors leaving the government marketplace. A less competitive indus-

trial base limits the ability of the Department of Defense to control costs and encourage innovation. The committee therefore incorporated several provisions in S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, aimed at reducing barriers and costs of participating in the Federal marketplace, that would:

(1) Require the Cost Account Board to meet and reduce differences between Government cost accounting standards and private-sector Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, while allowing private-sector auditors to certify contractor business systems that are required by Government cost accounting.

(2) Treat services offered by non-traditional contractors as commercial items, which reduces the Government-unique overhead on such contractors.

(3) Focus the initial selection of contractors on multiple-award contracts on technical qualifications, with price and value evaluated only for subsequent task orders, while raising the protest threshold for Department of Defense task orders from \$10.0 million to \$25.0 million.

(4) Adopt several provisions to strengthen and enhance the role of small businesses in the industrial base.

#### *Information Technology and Business Systems*

Information technology (IT) systems are critical enablers for the Department of Defense. As the IT budget represents nearly \$32 billion of the Department of Defense's total budget, it also represents a major investment area requiring the same rigorous planning, analysis, and oversight as any other complex major weapon system. The Department recognized this area as a source of greater efficiencies, and has managed to reduce spending in IT by several billion dollars across the Future Years Defense Program. It remains to be seen if these reductions are driving any real change in how the Department does business, or whether those reductions are made with any strategic plan in mind.

The committee continued to review the Department's IT investment planning and review processes, as well as specific acquisitions, to improve the ability to identify and reduce unwarranted duplication and eliminate programs of little value to the warfighter. The committee has paid particular attention to how the Department leverages the commercial marketplace, as well as the various IT systems of the Department where egregious programmatic failures have been made to provide lessons for future acquisitions. The committee has focused on how the IT investments of the Department will contribute to future warfighting capability, and support a defensible architecture that is resilient to cyber attacks, while maintaining the command and control to support mission needs.

The committee held related hearings on February 25, 2015, "Information Technology Investments and Programs: Supporting Current Operations and Planning for the Future Threat Environment"; and a hearing on March 22, 2016, "Fiscal Year 2017 Information Technology and Cyber Programs for Foundations for a Secure Warfighting Network."

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the com-

mittee included several reporting requirements related to information technology, including a report on plans for expansion of the Civil Support Team Information Management Systems, and a report by the Comptroller General of the United States assessing the Department of Defense's actions and measures to address the risk of losing access to its current source of trusted leading-edge micro-electronics.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included: a provision that revises section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify responsibilities for the management of defense business systems; a provision that amended chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section that would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a senior official of the Department of Defense to act as an executive agent for open source intelligence tools; a provision that limits the availability of funds for the Army's Distributed Common Ground System to 75 percent of the funds authorized to be obligated by the program until the Secretary of the Army conducts a review of the program planning; a provision that limits the availability of funds for the Special Operations Command's Distributed Common Ground System to 75 percent of the funds authorized to be obligated by the program until the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command conducts a review of the program planning; a provision that requires an assessment of open technology standards applicable to Department of Defense procurements for IT systems; a provision that requires the Department of Defense to conduct a business case analysis to determine the most cost effective and efficient way to acquire common network services; a provision that requires a cloud strategy for a secret level of classified information and the Secret Internet Protocol network; a provision that modifies the requirements applicable to a major automated information system program that fails to achieve a full development decision within 5 years; and a provision that limits the authority of the Secretary of the Army to obligate more than 75 percent of the total authorized amount of fiscal year 2016 program funds for the Integrated Personnel and Pay System-Army until a report is provided on the program.

H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, included a provision that would limit the availability of funds for cryptographic systems and key management infrastructure programs until the Department reports of the coordination of such efforts.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee included several reporting requirements related to information technology, including: a briefing on the roadmap for development and fielding of the open architecture version of the Distributed Common Ground System for the Air Force; a briefing on the analysis of the human capital needs of the Office of the Deputy Chief Management Officer; a briefing on the Department's use of information technology asset tracking technology; a briefing on the status of the implementation of the current Cloud Access Program; a briefing on the best practices and lessons learned for use and configuration for the Host Based Security System; a briefing on

how insider threat capabilities are planned to be integrated into the Joint Information Environment; a strategic plan for the Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center; and a briefing on the Secretary of Defense's plans to ensure a continued domestic source of strategic-hardened trusted microelectronics.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes: a provision that would require modifications to the training and fielding plan for the currently fielded version of the Army's Distributed Common Ground System; a provision that would require the restructuring of future versions of the Army's Distributed Common Ground System; a provision that would require the Department to modernize the security clearance information technology architecture for the federal government as well as a proposed implementation plan for moving some clearance investigation processes back to the Department; a provision that would require a strategy for assured access to trusted microelectronics; a provision that would allow for a pilot program to rapidly evaluate commercial information technology systems for defense needs; a provision that would require a review of policies and guidance related to the use of anti-competitive specifications in information technology acquisitions; a provision that would modify and expand the information technology exchange program; a provision that would repeal the requirements for Major Automated Information Systems by September 30, 2017; a provision that would modify the responsibilities of the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer in title 10; a provision that would allow for an exemption from requirement for capital planning and investment control for information technology equipment included as an integral part of a weapon or weapon system; a provision that would allow for the increased use of commercial data integration and analysis products for the purpose of preparing financial statement audits; a provision that would require a strategic plan for the Defense Information Systems Agency; and a provision that would limit the ability of the Air Force to declare full operational capability for the Joint Regional Security Stacks until operational testing has occurred.

#### ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

As part of the committee's emphasis on defense reform, it undertook significant oversight and legislative action in the 114th Congress to improve the organization and management of the Department of Defense in order to ensure that it is properly postured to meet the complex and evolving security threats of the 21st century and to maintain U.S. technological superiority.

In 2015, the committee focused its oversight on streamlining Department of Defense management headquarters, to include creating greater accountability in headquarters budgets and personnel and better insight into Department efforts to implement actual and planned reductions. Subsequently, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) contained a provision to require the Department to implement a 25 percent reduction to headquarters activities and conduct a comprehensive review of headquarters, administrative, and support functions.

In 2016, the committee reviewed the 30-year old Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law

99–433) and engaged with numerous experts across the defense, academic, and private sector communities to examine opportunities for organizational and joint matters reform. In July 2016, the committee held a hearing with outside experts on “Goldwater-Nichols Reform: The Way Ahead,” and received a briefing from senior Department of Defense leaders on how potential Goldwater-Nichols reforms would affect Pentagon management and operations. S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, contains several Goldwater-Nichols reform-related provisions, including a restructuring of the Office of the Secretary of Defense to elevate research and engineering, better focus acquisition and sustainment activities, and improve oversight and management of the Department’s “fourth estate,” as well as a review of the combatant command structure. S. 2943 would also enhance the responsibilities and tenure of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; revise the definition of “joint duty matters” to better reflect the types of joint duty positions for which an officer may receive joint duty credit; and reduce the number of general and flag officers, as well as senior executive service personnel, by roughly 11 percent, to address concerns about the growth in headquarters and command senior staff. Lastly, S. 2943 would also include reforms to the National Security Council.

## READINESS

### OVERVIEW

The Subcommittee on Readiness focused oversight in the 114th Congress on Department of Defense training, logistics, maintenance, military construction, installations, family housing, civilian personnel management, and energy and the environment. The committee remains concerned about the detrimental impacts to military readiness wrought by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25). The cumulative impacts of this law include lost training opportunities, delayed or deferred ship deployments, missed depot availabilities, deferred maintenance requirements, and added stress to service men and women.

The Subcommittee on Readiness held multiple hearings and briefings focused on the readiness of the military services. Witnesses spoke of the degraded state of readiness throughout the force. Military leaders testified it would take years to achieve full-spectrum readiness for any future conflict with a near-peer competitor.

Subcommittee-sponsored travel included congressional delegations to visit military and civilian leaders in the Republic of Iraq, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and Arab Republic of Egypt in the Middle East; the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Federal Republic of Germany, Kingdom of Belgium, Republic of Poland, Republic of Latvia, and Republic of Estonia in Europe; and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Kingdom of Thailand, Malaysia, Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Republic of the Philippines, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Okinawa, Territory of Guam, Saipan, and Tinian in Asia and the Pacific. Subcommittee staff visited numerous domestic and overseas military posts, bases, training centers, arsenals, depots, and shipyards to hear from uniformed lead-

ers, see firsthand their training, listen to their readiness concerns, and observe their military construction activities.

#### FORCE READINESS

The committee focused oversight on the cumulative impacts of underfunding readiness, in particular the operation and maintenance, military construction, facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization accounts. The Subcommittee on Readiness held multiple hearings on the subject involving the Department of Defense and each of the military services, both active and reserve components. Witnesses detailed the continued erosion of readiness throughout the force, asking not only for increased funding but funding stability as well. The lack of adequate and stable funding resulting from the Budget Control Act (Public Law 112–25) and delayed appropriations force the services to defer maintenance on real property, increasing future costs. The conflict in Syria, the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and regional aggression by Russia and China were also noted as factors pressuring military readiness. For the services, this meant continuous overseas deployments and little opportunity to conduct deferred maintenance on major end items or undergo long-neglected training for high-end threats. The continued drawdown of force strength, particularly in the Army, exacerbated readiness challenges. The committee took note of an increasing number of aircraft accidents and raised concern that this category of equipment could be the first glimpse into a larger future readiness crisis. In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee directed the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the Department’s plans to rebuild readiness, conduct an assessment of Army and Air Force training requirements, and review the Navy’s Optimized Fleet Response Plan. H. Rept. 114–537 also directed the service chiefs of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on rotary-wing aviation readiness and safety.

#### *Army*

The Army fully funds the maximum number of brigade combat team rotations through its Combat Training Centers, which it views as a crucial requirement for a return to training for full spectrum combat operations. In repeated testimony and in roundtable discussions with committee Members, Army military and civilian leaders emphasized that returning to full spectrum readiness following years of preparing primarily for counterinsurgency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan would take years. Army leaders anticipated that they would achieve full spectrum readiness no earlier than 2021. This timeline, they added, would be difficult to accelerate but was at risk given the current scheduled drawdown of Army end strength and budget instability. Army leaders were concerned that they were continuing to do as much with fewer available forces, and emphasized that while confident that deploying units were fully prepared, their readiness came at the expense of units either recovering from deployments or preparing to deploy.

The Subcommittee on Readiness shared these concerns and noted the fragility of the readiness of just-deployed and next-to-deploy units, which was highlighted during hearings and field visits. Committee members noted that new training opportunities in Eastern Europe as a result of European Reassurance Initiative funding increased unit readiness as well as partner-nation capacity. The committee received briefings and provided oversight on other Army-led training initiatives such as Pacific Pathways and the Regionally Aligned Force in U.S. Africa Command.

#### *Navy and Marine Corps*

The committee remains concerned that high operational tempo leaves insufficient time and resources to adequately repair and refit Navy ships and aircraft. The Subcommittee on Readiness heard in testimony that the Navy's attempt to maximize ship employability through its Optimized Fleet Response Plan remained at risk due to deferred maintenance now coming due and unplanned or extended deployments. Navy leaders emphasized that ships on extended deployments often required additional, unplanned, and time-consuming repairs upon their return. In both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee included additional funds for ship and aircraft depot maintenance in an attempt to address the backlog of Navy maintenance requirements.

Like the Army, the Marine Corps is experiencing higher-than-expected operational tempo and reduced force structure. Marine Corps leaders expressed similar concerns with next-to-deploy units, whose readiness suffered in order to ensure deploying units were ready. Of particular concern was the lack of cumulative flying time for Marine Corps aviators, whose skills were in danger of atrophying due to lack of flying time caused in large part by the lack of availability of aircraft due to maintenance backlogs.

#### *Air Force*

The committee found that the Air Force's operational tempo has not lessened with combat operations increasing in the Middle East as a result of the rise of violent extremist organizations. The imbalance between introduction of the F–35 and the sunset of older airframes exacerbates maintenance and manning challenges. The reduction in the F–35 replacement rate for older aircraft worsens the readiness challenges by forcing competition for scarce resources between legacy platforms and beddowns for the new. These legacy airframes are experiencing increased engine and structural fatigue, deterioration, corrosion, and increased rates of component failures. While the Air Force is also concerned about a shortage of pilots, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness, Air Force leaders stated their biggest readiness concern is a shortage of 4,000 mechanics.

### LIFE-CYCLE SUSTAINMENT

Without appropriate and timely input from the logistics community, decisions made during system design can create unnecessary sustainment problems that drive millions of dollars in depot-level

maintenance once the system is fielded. The committee focused on reducing the total-ownership costs of weapon systems and equipment by ensuring the Department of Defense is developing, procuring, and modernizing weapon systems and equipment with consideration of life-cycle support and sustainment requirements and cost. In its oversight of the Department's life-cycle sustainment efforts, the committee monitored the implementation of section 2337 of title 10, United States Code, which requires that each major weapon system be supported by a product support manager and section 832 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), which requires additional visibility of the operation and support of major weapon systems. The committee included provisions in S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, that address the role of Technical Data Rights in life-cycle sustainment and how the costs are shared between private and Government agencies and contracts. Section 844 of S. 2943 would provide a requirement for the “Review and Report on Sustainment Planning in the Acquisition Process”. This review would address sustainment matters throughout the process: requirements generation, research and development, acquisition, cost estimating, and programming and budgeting. The committee also held the Department accountable for improving its estimations of total weapon system life-cycle costs to better inform sustainment strategies, such as the cost effectiveness of acquiring technical data from original equipment manufacturers to allow future changes in sustainment path. Furthermore, the committee continued its oversight of the Department's corrosion control efforts and monitored resourcing of corrosion prediction and prevention efforts with a focus on increasing the service life of weapon systems while reducing long-term sustainment costs. S. 2943 includes two specific provisions that would address the topic of corrosion control: section 322, “Revision of Guidance Related to Corrosion Control and Prevention Executives”, and section 954, “Modification to Corrosion Report”.

#### DEPOT AND ARSENAL CAPABILITY

A critical piece of equipment sustainment is the capability provided by the Nation's organic arsenals and depots, including air logistics centers and shipyards. The committee is concerned about the long-term health of the organic industrial base during an extended period of unstable and unpredictable funding, which has led to a prolonged period of significant fluctuation in workloads across the organic industrial base. While some military departments have completed an organic industrial base sustainment plan, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense continues to lack a comprehensive strategy to ensure U.S. military depots and arsenals are viably positioned and have the workforce, equipment, and facilities for efficient operations to meet the Nation's current requirements, as well as those in the future. The committee will continue oversight of depot and arsenal operations and management, focusing on capital investment in facilities and equipment, the implementation methodology and use of sustainment concepts such as performance-based logistics, the role of public-private partnerships, the use of working capital funds for timely product im-

provement, and the services' logistics enterprise resource planning systems. Furthermore, the committee will examine how previous efficiency initiatives and workforce reductions impact depot and arsenal capability, how more recent initiatives to increase arsenal and depot visibility among program managers and program executive offices are working, and how well programs and plans designed to assure the availability of critical organic manufacturing capabilities are being executed.

#### CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

The committee remained concerned about the Department of Defense's strategic workforce planning for its civilian personnel. The committee sought to provide the Department with additional means to effectively manage its Federal civilian workforce. In the National Defense Authorization Act for 2016 (Public Law 114-92) significant provisions included requiring reductions in force of Department of Defense civilian personnel to be based primarily on performance, and lengthening the probationary period for new employees from 1 to 2 years.

In 2016, the Department unveiled a series of military and civilian personnel proposals called "Force of the Future." The committee received several briefings on the Department's legislative proposals and scrutinized their usefulness. S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, contains many of these proposals, including several provisions that would give the Department direct hire authority for multiple categories of employees, in particular for the organic industrial base, the Major Test and Range Facilities Base, and some post-secondary students and recent graduates; an increase in the maximum amount of voluntary separation incentive pay the Department can offer civilian employees; and a provision that would allow temporary and term-limited employees to qualify for non-competitive permanent appointment to the civilian service. Most of these provisions are temporary and require the Department to provide reports on their effectiveness in order to extend or make the authority permanent in the future.

#### ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

The committee conducted oversight of the Department of Defense's energy activities in the 114th Congress. This included close examination of the strategies and policies for both installation energy and operational energy to enhance combat capabilities, strengthen mission assurance and resiliency, and reduce operating costs for the Department. In addition, the committee closely monitored the Department's policies and programs related to legacy and emergent environmental contamination and response plans. Finally, the committee continued its oversight and efforts to mitigate potential impacts to military training and operations due to energy developments in proximity to military installations.

##### *Operational Energy*

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, included several provisions regarding operational energy policy, to address the procurement of alter-

native fuels. Public Law 114–92 amended subchapter II of chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit Department of Defense funds from being used to make bulk purchases of drop-in fuel for operational purposes, unless the cost of that drop-in fuel is cost-competitive with traditional fuel. In addition, as directed by the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee requested the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency to provide a briefing that addresses the process used to evaluate and determine whether an alternative fuel is cost-competitive with conventional fuels, including the use of any funds provided by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Finally, S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, included a provision amending section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140; 42 U.S.C. 17142) to allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the requirement of section 526 for the procurement of fuel if in the interest of national security.

#### *Installation Energy*

With respect to installation energy, the committee focused its oversight on the implementation and efficacy of the Department of Defense’s current programs. As directed by committee report (H. Rept. 114–270) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee was briefed by the General Accounting Office on the degree to which the Department has identified benefits, as well as challenges, from its net zero installation initiatives, and any areas where improvements are needed. As directed by the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee also requested the Comptroller General of the United States to review the extent to which the Department of Defense is effectively leveraging appropriations to repay developers for alternatively financed energy savings, efficiency, or generating capacity projects, details on energy savings, efficiency, and generating capacity projects financed since 2012, reliability of reported project energy savings and efficiency performance, and to what extent the Department’s installations utilities budgets have been encumbered to repay contractors in energy savings performance contracts, utilities energy services contracts, or other alternative project financing.

Furthermore, in H. Rept. 114–537, the committee was supportive of efforts by the Department and encouraged the Department to better leverage and integrate existing authorities to ensure installations have resilient, available, reliable, and continuous power during disruptions to the electrical supply, prioritizing facilities supporting mission critical functions and done under an enterprise approach and in a manner that is cost-effective and based on assessed vulnerabilities. To that end, S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes a provision that would allow energy resiliency and energy security projects to be funded using the Department’s Energy Conservation Investment Program (ECIP).

### *Energy Siting and Encroachment*

The committee has continued to monitor potential impacts on military training and operations posed by energy developments proposed near military installations. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) amended section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to expand coverage of the Siting Clearinghouse to requests for informal reviews by Indian tribes and landowners, clarify that information received from private entities is not publicly releasable, eliminate categories of adverse risk, and limit applicability of section to only energy projects. In addition, in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–270) to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee directed the Department of Defense to report on the science, standards, assumptions, and criteria by which the Department assesses the risk to military missions or training ranges. Finally, in S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for the Fiscal Year 2017, the committee included a provision that would amend section 44718 of title 49, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to include the interests of national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, in the Secretary of Transportation’s aeronautical studies and reports required under this statute in regards to structures interfering with air commerce.

### *Environment*

The committee conducted oversight of environmental issues resulting from Department of Defense activities on military installations, training ranges, and operational activities to include the military services’ environmental restoration program and adherence to Federal, state, and local cleanup, compliance, and pollution prevention requirements. There have been several areas of emerging concern to include protecting the Department’s training, testing, and operations from encroachment, emerging contaminants that may require remediation by the Department, and the ability for the Department to operate in the Arctic.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included a section to chapter 631 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the conservation needs of the Southern Sea Otter while continuing the protections for military readiness activities at important offshore islands in the Southern California Bight.

Public Law 114–92 also modified section 2602(2)(B) of title 15, United States Code, to add exclusion of any component of any article, including shot, bullets and other projectiles, propellants when manufactured for or used in such an article, and primers.

The committee continued oversight of the engineering assessment of Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility and in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–270) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 directed a follow-up briefing not later than 30 days after the date of approval of the best available practicable technological solutions for tank repairs.

The committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 began what

is anticipated to be a long term assessment on the Department's response to health advisory levels for perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) chemicals found in Aqueous Film-Forming Foam used to fight fires. Specifically, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than March 1, 2017, regarding the Department's efforts and initiatives in response to significant concern on the basis of evidence showing exposure to PFOS and PFOA may have led to indications of toxicity in humans. Specifically, the briefing should address: the Department's current policies regarding PFOA and PFOS; the programmatic approach being taken by the Department of Defense to identify, investigate, and respond to the presence of PFOA and PFAS at military installations; and the programmatic approach to the removal and replacement of PFOAs and PFOSs in AFFF firefighting foam.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

### BASING

The Department of Defense is undergoing a significant change in force structure both in the United States and overseas as a result of the drawdown of military forces from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Global Defense Posture Review, and budgetary pressures being placed on the Department of Defense. These rebasing movements affect not only U.S. global presence, but they may also have significant repercussions for readiness, surge capability, military construction, and quality of life for military members and their families.

The committee has been specifically interested in ensuring the Department of Defense has the requisite tools and capabilities to support the Pacific rebalance effort. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) included a section that authorized construction funds for a public waste water improvement project to support the realignment of military forces from Okinawa to Guam. In Public Law 114-92, the committee took further action to also authorize support for the construction of a cultural repository to store sensitive artifacts uncovered during the military construction program for the U.S. Marine Corps and U.S. Air Force posture initiatives on Guam.

Further supporting the oversight of the Pacific rebalance effort, Public Law 114-92 also required the Department to submit an annual report to the congressional defense committees for each of fiscal years 2017-26 that would address the total amount contributed from the Government of Japan to support the United States Relocation to Guam Account during the most recent year, as well as the anticipated contributions to be made during the current and next Japanese fiscal years.

The committee also provided oversight of the Department's European Consolidation Initiative, receiving multiple briefs on the planned base closures, mission support infrastructure consolidation and funding strategy for reduction in European military presence. Further, the committee received briefs on infrastructure investments required to support the European Reassurance Initiative in

Eastern Europe, those infrastructure builds that improved training opportunities and multi-modal options for U.S. forces.

While not specific to a single geographic area, the committee took several steps to increase oversight on the overseas posture and infrastructure requirements of the Department. Specifically, Public Law 114–92 included a provision that required specific reporting requirements on the goals and operational requirements, anticipated infrastructure investments required, and terms of the agreements with the host nation for newly designated overseas cooperative security locations, forward operating sites, and main operating bases. In addition, in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing on the development of facility requirements for overseas enduring locations supporting contingency operations and how improvements are being made to improve the long-term infrastructure planning and programming process.

The committee also assessed the Department of Defense’s request for an additional round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). Public Law 114–92 retained the BRAC restriction from previous years, including language that stated nothing in the Act shall be construed to authorize a future BRAC round. However, in an effort to better inform Congress and standardize the military service assessments, Public Law 114–92 included a provision for the Department to conduct an excess infrastructure capacity assessment based on current infrastructure data and fiscal year 2012 force structure levels. The restriction on carrying out another round of BRAC was also included in S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2017.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMMING

With regard to construction programming, the committee continued its efforts to provide combatant commanders limited authority to rapidly implement contingency construction to address emerging construction requirements. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) contained a provision that authorized the use of operations and maintenance funds for contingency construction. This provision was again carried in S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2017.

Public Law 114–92 authorized a \$150 million per year pilot program for the Secretary of Defense to accept contributions from the Government of the State of Kuwait through fiscal year 2020 in support of construction, maintenance, and repair projects within Kuwait that are mutually beneficial to the Department of Defense and the Kuwait military forces. This provision was further modified by S. 2943 to extend the authorization through fiscal year 2030.

Further, Public Law 114–92 aligned Reserve Component minor construction and repair thresholds with the thresholds specified in chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, fixing an oversight in the authority changes from the previous year.

Finally, the committee undertook a number of legislative initiatives aimed at providing the Department with additional tools and flexibility to manage and invest in their facilities. Public Law 114–92 included a provision establishing a pilot program for laboratory

facility modernization by allowing up to \$150.0 million in research, development, test, and evaluation funds to be used per year for military construction projects supporting any Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratory or Department of Defense federally funded research and development center. The authority lasts for 5 years and would require projects to be requested by the Department and authorized as part of the national defense authorization act. S. 2943 would amend section 2811 of title 10, United States Code, to reclassify facility conversion projects as repair, allowing work within the existing dimensions of a facility to be considered repair and utilize operations & maintenance funding instead of limited military construction funds. In addition, S. 2943 would increase the minor military construction threshold for laboratory revitalization projects from \$4.0 million to \$6.0 million while adding in a congressional notification requirement for such projects.

#### REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION, MAINTENANCE, AND DISPOSAL

The real property management process requires extensive oversight to maintain more than \$850.3 billion in infrastructure at an annual cost of almost \$37.0 billion, or nearly 7.5 percent, of the Department of Defense's budget.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included a provision to enhance the authority to accept conditional gifts of real property on behalf of the military service academies, if the gift of such real property is conditioned upon the property bearing a specified name. The committee authorized the military service academies to accept such a gift if the acceptance and naming would not reflect unfavorably on the United States, and the real property has not otherwise been named by an act of Congress.

In addition, Public Law 114–92 authorized a land exchange at Mare Island Army Reserve Center, Vallejo, California, and Navy Outlying Landing Field, Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida; released property interests retained in connection with Fort Bliss Military Reservation, Texas; and provided additional land withdraw for Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California. S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for 2017, includes additional land conveyances at the High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program facility in Gakona, Alaska, Campion Air Force Radar Station in Galena, Alaska, Colbern Army Reserve Center in Laredo, Texas, and St. George National Guard Armory in St. George, Utah. S. 2943 also includes a provision that would authorize the exchanges of Federal and non-Federal lands and take other actions required to expand the boundaries of the Utah Test and Training Range and mitigate possible encroachment on the range.

The committee reviewed the Department of Defense facility sustainment accounts and found significant shortfalls that must be addressed to manage and sustain the mission. The committee increased funding to these accounts in both Public Law 114–92 and S. 2943 to address shortfalls in the facility sustainment accounts to partially support systemic facility sustainment deficits.

## TOTAL FORCE, PERSONNEL, AND HEALTH CARE ISSUES

## MANPOWER SUFFICIENT IN QUANTITY AND QUALITY TO MEET GLOBAL COMMITMENTS

Some argue that military personnel costs have exploded and will continue to rise to unsustainable levels. The committee rejects that assertion because such a budget-oriented focus misses the fundamental question that the committee addressed: What does the Nation need in terms of the quantity of manpower and the quality of that manpower to meet its current and future global military commitments, without undue risk to the Nation. In this context, the fiscal year 2015 budget request proposed to continue to reduce the end strengths of the Army and Marine Corps by 100,000 over a 5-year period, which began with the fiscal year 2013 budget request, bringing both services down to approximately pre-9/11 levels.

The committee remains concerned with the planned reductions while the military services face potential challenges from near-peers and are still engaged in stability operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, advisory and training missions in the Republic of Iraq and numerous smaller engagements throughout the world. Reflecting that concern, the committee continued to provide detailed oversight of military manpower levels and force structure during the first session of the 114th Congress. The committee remained concerned with the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) impacts on the ability of the military services to maintain manpower levels sufficient to meet the National Military Strategy. The committee supported the end strengths of the military services as requested in the President's budget in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), which continued the pre-planned budget-driven reduction of service end-strength. The committee supported the requested end-strengths while closely monitoring the effect on readiness.

In the second session of the 114th Congress, the committee addressed the concern about reductions and the impacts of a continued end-strength draw-down by stopping the draw-down of both the Active and Reserve Components and by increasing the end-strength levels above the 2016 levels in S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. The committee continued to provide aggressive oversight of military manpower levels and force structure to ensure they met the requirements of the National Military Strategy. This oversight sought to provide Active, Guard and Reserve Forces that have manpower levels sufficient to sustain varying scales of activation, while maintaining deployment ratios at or above Department of Defense objectives. On March 3, 2016, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive a round-table briefing on the military personnel posture for fiscal year 2017. With that focus, the committee continued to examine closely trends in overall total force structure requirements, end strength, recruiting, retention, morale, benefits and compensation changes that will enhance the future force.

MORALE, WELFARE AND RECREATION PROGRAMS AND MILITARY  
RESALE PROGRAMS

While some have criticized the Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) and military resale programs (commissary and exchange stores) as being unnecessary, wasteful and targeted for reductions in appropriated funding, the committee believes the cost efficient sustainment of MWR and military resale programs is required to protect quality of life in military communities and maintain the combat readiness of the force. The committee continued to provide oversight efforts directed toward that end.

The committee believes that MWR and military resale programs must remain competitive with private sector entities to ensure that service members and their families benefit fully from these programs. The committee monitored current practices and policies to ensure that MWR and military resale programs are employing the full range of strategies available to private sector competitors to inform authorized patrons about the benefits associated with these programs and attract them to participate. This is especially true for commissaries that are restricted from using pricing, product, and advertising strategies that are common in the private sector because of legislative and policy barriers. The Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) required the Department of Defense to review management, food, and pricing options for the Defense Commissary System in consultation with an organization experienced in grocery retail analysis to assist in maintaining a competitive and effective commissary system in the future.

During the 114th Congress, the committee continued to review and to propose changes to the commissary system, many based on the results of the study directed in Public Law 113–291. The Boston Consulting Group’s results form the basis for reforms in the military resale system that was considered as part of S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. The goal of the reform effort is to maintain the enduring savings achieved by military families using the commissary system while reducing the commissary’s reliance on appropriated funds for its operations. In this effort the subcommittee has met for closed briefings on resale reform with the Department of Defense along with the Boston Consulting Group to hear and discuss the results of their study, and has considered the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission results on military resale reform.

On September 17, 2015, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive the recommendations and the results of the military resale study conducted by the Boston Consulting Group. On October 23, 2015, the subcommittee met for a roundtable briefing on the Department of Defense views on military resale reform. This briefing set the stage for commissary reform and focused on the Department of Defense views on the reform recommendations. On January 13, 2016, the subcommittee met to hear testimony from the Department of Defense on the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission’s recommendations on military resale reform. On September 13, 2016, the subcommittee continued its oversight efforts and met to receive a roundtable briefing

on an update on commissary reform from the Department of Defense. The committee's oversight on commissary reform led to the inclusion of major commissary reform in S. 2943.

#### MILITARY BENEFITS AND COMPENSATION

During the 114th Congress, the Department of Defense budget remained under considerable stress and military benefits were targeted for reductions. The committee gave close scrutiny to proposals from the Department of Defense and other organizations, both Government and private sector, calling for funding reductions to military compensation and other benefit programs to ensure any proposed change fully assesses the impact to the All-Volunteer Force. The committee continued to monitor compensation programs during the first and second sessions of the 114th Congress to ensure an adequate quality of life for service members and their families, and to ensure that pay and benefits meet the needs of the wartime military and keep pace with private sector standards.

On February 11, 2015, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive testimony on the final recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. On March 17, 2015, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met for a closed Member roundtable on the retirement and quality of life recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to focus on military retirement reform. Finally on March 25, 2015, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive testimony on the stakeholder's views on the recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. These oversight meetings contributed to the inclusion of the reform of the military retirement system in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92), which authorized the implementation of a new military retirement system based on the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission's recommendations.

The subcommittee's oversight of pay and allowance issues led the committee as part of S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, to recommend no change to current law, which would require the by-law 2.1 percent raise in basic pay during fiscal year 2017 based on section 1009 of title 37, United States Code. It is the intent of the underlying law to ensure military pay raises match the rate of compensation increases in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index. The committee extended the authorities to pay bonuses and special pays during fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017 and monitored the value of those bonuses and special pays to ensure they were sufficient to achieve the recruiting and retention objectives for which they were developed. The committee also included legislation that increased the pilot bonus to begin to address the Air Force's pilot shortage.

On September 17, 2015, the subcommittee met to receive the recommendations and the results of the military resale study conducted by the Boston Consulting Group. On October 23, 2015, the subcommittee met for a roundtable briefing on the Department of Defense views on military resale reform. This briefing set the stage for commissary reform and focused on the Department's views on the reform recommendations. On January 13, 2016, the sub-

committee met for its first hearing on the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission's recommendations on military resale reform. On September 13, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing to receive an update on commissary reform from the Department. The committee's active oversight on commissary reform led to the inclusion of major commissary reform in S. 2943.

On December 9, 2015, the subcommittee met to hear testimony from the stakeholders on the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP), Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC) financial offset. A provision of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) established a Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance (SSIA) for surviving spouses who are the beneficiary of the SBP annuity and have their annuity partially or fully offset by the DIC. This allowance was due to expire at the end of fiscal year 2017. The committee's oversight in this area led to an extension of the SSIA until May 31, 2018, in S. 2843.

#### MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A continued principal focus of the committee during the 114th Congress was the adequacy and effectiveness of mental health services provided to members of the Armed Forces and their families. Particular attention was given to the suicide prevention efforts undertaken by each military service and the consistency and comprehensiveness of the Department of Defense policy on prevention of suicide among members of the Armed Forces and their families, including methods of collecting and assessing suicide data. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel met on June 15, 2015, for a briefing on military suicide prevention programs from the Department of Defense and the military services.

The committee continues to be concerned that access to mental health services for service members and their families remains limited. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) encouraged the Secretary of Defense to utilize existing direct hire authorities to fill vacancies in critical health care occupations, such as mental health specialists. In addition, S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would require the Department to maximize the use of telehealth capabilities to expand access to increase the availability of critical health care services.

#### SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY

The committee continued to focus on the effectiveness and viability of Department of Defense and the military services' sexual assault prevention and response programs, with a particular emphasis on victim care and support. The committee also conducted a holistic review of the military justice system and the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) to ensure the system effectively and efficiently holds offenders of all crimes appropriately accountable. The committee's work was informed by the independent assessments of the Judicial Proceedings Panel, as well as the thorough review of the UCMJ conducted by the Military Justice Review Group.

The committee also provided oversight of the Department's implementation of the recommendations by the Responses Systems to Adult Sexual Assault Crimes Panel to improve programs and policies to prevent and address sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces. Finally, the committee focused on efforts to prevent and address retaliation and ostracism of members of the Armed Forces who report sex-related crimes.

The committee continued to provide robust oversight of the Department of Defense and the military departments' sexual assault prevention and response efforts. On February 4, 2015, the committee received the initial report of the Judicial Proceedings Panel. The report identified several areas for improvement, including recommendations to further enhance and standardize the Special Victims Counsel (SVC) program, as well as a recommendation to streamline changes to the UCMJ. These recommendations, along with substantial feedback from DOD and other stakeholders, informed the sexual assault provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92).

In furtherance of the committee's continued oversight of the Department's efforts to prevent future sexual assaults, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel also met to receive a closed briefing on June 24, 2015, on the implementation of the recommendations of the reviews following the sexual assault incidents at Lackland Air Force Base and to receive an update on the Air Force Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program.

Public Law 114-92 included a substantial number of bipartisan reforms designed to further refine the SVC program and the UCMJ. Specifically, these provisions:

- (1) Expand the SVC program to authorize SVCs to provide legal advice to Department of Defense civilian employees;
- (2) Direct the Secretary of Defense to standardize the content and timeline for SVC training;
- (3) Direct the Secretary of Defense to examine the process for implementing statutory changes to the UCMJ;
- (4) Require timely notification to sexual assault victims of the availability of SVC;
- (5) Enhance confidentiality of restricted reporting of sexual assault in the military by preempting any State law requiring certain professionals to report the personally identifiable information of a sexual assault victim;
- (6) Direct the Department of Defense to enhance prevention and response for sexual assaults in which a male member is the victim;
- (7) Prevent retaliation against service members who report or intervene on behalf a sexual assault victim;
- (8) Require retention of all case notes in sex-related investigations of the military departments for at least 50 years;
- (9) Direct the Secretary of Defense to develop procedures to streamline the implementation guidance regarding UCMJ changes;
- (10) Modify the Rules for Court-Martial to prohibit giving a less than favorable rating to SVCs because they zealously represented their clients; and

(11) Modify Military Rule of Evidence 304 to conform to the Federal court rules on admissibility of the corroboration of confessions, to the extent the President considers practicable.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes substantial bipartisan reforms designed to improve the fairness and efficiency of the UCMJ. These reforms are largely based on the 2015 recommendations of the Military Justice Review Group, a group of experts convened by the Secretary of Defense at the urging of Congress. The group was tasked with proposing changes that would modernize the UCMJ. The resulting provisions would:

(1) Enhance victims' rights through greater opportunities for input on disposition decisions at the preliminary stages of the case;

(2) Improve efficiency by authorizing a military magistrate program, much like civilian Federal courts, for the disposition of lower-level offenses;

(3) Improve transparency by providing for public access to court documents and pleadings;

(4) Standardize court-martial panel sizes (12 in capital cases, 8 in general courts-martial, and 4 in special courts-martial) and number required to convict (3/4);

(5) Improve visibility over sentencing data by requiring military judges who are sentencing the accused to adjudge a distinct sentence for each offense for which the accused was found guilty, rather than the current system under which the military judge adjudges a single sentence for all offenses (known as unitary sentencing);

(6) Expand the statute of limitations for child abuse offenses and fraudulent enlistment;

(7) Create several new offenses, including prohibiting retaliation; inappropriate relationships between a military recruit or trainee and a person in position of special trust; fraudulent use of credit and debit cards; and offenses concerning Government computers; and

(8) Relocate several established offenses from the general article (Article 134) and establishes them as individual articles.

#### MILITARY HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The committee is committed to maintaining a robust Military Health System (MHS) whose primary responsibility is readiness of the force. To accomplish this goal, the committee undertook a comprehensive review of the MHS to identify necessary reforms to sustain the long term viability of the system. To that end, the committee, particularly the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, focused oversight and legislative activities to make certain that the MHS can sustain trained and ready healthcare providers to support the readiness of the force and a quality healthcare benefit that is valued by its beneficiaries. The committee's efforts were focused in three areas: medical readiness, the MHS structure, and the TRICARE benefit.

During the first session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met several times to discuss the military health care system and recommendations from the Military Com-

pensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. On March 25, 2015, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive testimony from stakeholders on the recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. The subcommittee also met on March 19, 2015, for a roundtable on the health care recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. Lastly, on June 11, 2015, the subcommittee held a hearing on the Department of Defense views on the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission's recommendations for military health care reform.

The committee continued oversight through a series of activities focused on developing recommendations for a military health care reform legislative package. On November 4, 2015, the subcommittee met for a closed briefing on Health Insurance/ TRICARE 101. The subcommittee also met on November 18, 2015, for a briefing from former military Surgeons General on military health care reform. Subcommittee staff conducted a series of oversight visits to Military Treatment Facilities (MTF) to hear views on military health care from beneficiaries, MTF staff, and leadership.

The committee's efforts culminated in the most significant health care reform in decades. S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would ensure medical readiness; modernize the MHS and simplify the TRICARE benefit by directing the Department of Defense to establish a Joint Education and Trauma Training Directorate to create enduring partnerships with civilian trauma centers where military trauma surgeons and their teams can treat critically injured patients in the volume needed to maintain clinical proficiency; establish a Joint Trauma System to establish standards of care for all trauma services provided within the military health system; establish an executive-level management office within the Defense Health Agency to manage health care operations, budget, information technology and medical affairs across the military treatment facilities while preserving the responsibilities of the commanders of the facilities to ensure the readiness of the force and the missions of the military services' Surgeons General to man, train and equip the medical force. Further access to urgent care would be expanded and no longer require prior authorization, and primary care clinics within MTFs would be required to be open beyond standard business hours.

The TRICARE benefit would be improved by establishing TRICARE Preferred as the self-managed, preferred provider option that would replace TRICARE Standard and Extra. A future enrollment fee for current retirees under TRICARE Preferred would be contingent upon independent validation of improved network adequacy. A revised fee structure for military personnel entering service after January 1, 2018, would guarantee continuity of generous healthcare benefits for the future force.

On September 8, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on H.R. 4298: Vietnam Helicopter Crew Memorial Act and H.R. 5458: Veterans TRICARE Choice Act. The Veterans TRICARE Choice Act would allow retired TRICARE beneficiaries to opt out of TRICARE to become eligible for a Health Savings Account.

The committee continued oversight on the progress towards implementing the requirements for an electronic health record that is inter-operable with the electronic health record of the Veterans Administration by closely monitoring expenditures and acquisition activities and through quarterly updates from the Department of Defense Program Executive Officer. The committee is concerned with the planned delay in completing initial implementation in the northwest.

#### WOUNDED WARRIOR CARE

The committee continued to assess the adequacy of the Department of Defense policies and programs for wounded and disabled service members and their families. In this regard, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met on February 3, 2015, to receive testimony on the current status of the military services' programs that support the recovery of wounded and injured service members and their families and to assess the effectiveness of the support for the wounded and injured personnel. The subcommittee focused on policies regarding selection of individuals who work with wounded and injured personnel, access to medical care, service members transitioning from the military, support for injured and wounded members of the Reserve Component, and the Department's plans for maintaining the wounded warrior programs in the future. In addition, to evaluate the Department's ability to integrate and coordinate the multitude of services and resources available to assist the wounded and disabled with the Department of Veterans Affairs, the committee received a report of the status of programs authorized by section 1614 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) as directed by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92).

The committee remained concerned over the Army's plan to consolidate Warrior Transition Units (WTUs) as the number of wounded and injured in the existing WTUs were greatly reduced. The committee was also concerned about complaints received from wounded warriors about the way they were treated in some Army WTUs. The committee, in particular the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, engaged in discussions with the Army Warrior Transition Command leadership regarding the consolidation plans. In addition, Public Law 114-92 directed the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate whether there are systemic mistreatment issues in the Army WTUs and the Army's plan to maintain the WTU capability with fewer soldiers and resources. Oversight activities also included several staff visits to the military services' units responsible for the care, recovery and transition of wounded, ill, and injured service members.

The committee continued to provide oversight on the timeliness of the Integrated Disability Evaluation System. The committee monitored, through quarterly reports from the Department of Defense and the military services, progress toward reducing the time a service member remains in the Integrated Disability Evaluation System and the backlog of cases awaiting completion.

## MILITARY FAMILY READINESS

The committee focused on the needs of military families who continue to experience the strains associated with deployments. The committee recognized the risk to the viability of family programs as end strengths of the Armed Forces are reduced and resources shrink. The committee engaged in discussions with the Department of Defense and the military services to ensure that family programs continue to provide robust support to needs of family members. Of particular concern is the availability of child care services on military installations and the significant backlog of military parents waiting to enroll their children in military Child Development Centers. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) required the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to reduce the backlog by 50 percent by October 1, 2017. In addition, the committee recognizes the challenges children of military families face as a result of multiple deployments and the tragedy of a loss of a military parent. S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to support non-profit organizations that provide camp experiences to military children who have experienced the death of a parent, a parent with substance abuse disorder or post-traumatic stress disorder.

## PRISONER OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION

During the 114th Congress, the committee continued active oversight of the Department of Defense's Prisoner of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) activities. The committee specifically focused on the implementation of modifications to the requirements for accounting for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing by establishing a single defense agency for POW/MIA affairs directed by the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). Committee staff met on numerous occasions with the leadership of the new Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency (DPAA) to discuss progress in integrating the two former agencies under the DPAA. During the first session of the 114th Congress, committee staff visited the DPAA headquarters in Hawaii for an orientation to the new facilities and to hear views on the consolidation from DPAA employees.

Further, the committee continued to assess the progress towards meeting the requirement that the accounting effort achieve significantly higher levels of identification that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). Of particular concern are the challenges associated with declassification procedures for documents greater than 25 years old that may aid in the location of persons that are MIA. To that end, H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as passed by the House, directed the Secretary of Defense to identify inefficiencies in the process to declassify documents that, if addressed, could improve recovery efforts.

## WOMEN IN SERVICE

During the 114th Congress, the committee built upon the work of the 113th Congress towards ensuring that opening all military occupations to women will enhance the warfighting capabilities and readiness of the Armed Forces. The committee began an extensive effort to evaluate the military services' process for developing gender-neutral occupational standards established for each occupational specialty that was opened to women. The committee received numerous staff level briefings on the progress toward completing gender-neutral occupational standards. As a result, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) required the Secretary of Defense to add readiness to the criteria for gender-neutral occupational standards.

The committee focused on the military services' assessment activities undertaken to assess the impact of opening the remaining combat arms military occupational specialties (MOS) to female soldiers. Committee staff visited Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms to observe the activities of the Ground Combat Element Integrated Task Force established by the Commandant of the Marine Corps to assess the effect of gender integration in closed and open MOS, closed MOS units and readiness. Committee staff also traveled to Fort Benning, Georgia, to observe the Army Ranger Assessment Program that included women as course participants as well as women as observers in preparation for opening the Ranger School to women.

Following the conclusion of the military services' assessment activities and the Secretary of Defense's announcement that all remaining MOS would be open to women, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met for a briefing from the Department of Defense and the military services on the data collection and methodology of the Women in Service Review. Committee staff received briefings on the military services' personnel policies and assignment practices for the newly opened occupational specialties and the long-term plans for assuring retention and advancement for women in newly opened career fields.

## MODERNIZATION AND INVESTMENT ISSUES

## OVERVIEW

During the 114th Congress, the committee devoted particular attention to the examination of military equipment modernization strategies with respect to overall military readiness capability and capacity against all threats and adversaries. The committee conducted oversight of the full range of issues facing Department of Defense modernization and investment programs to include the impacts of current budget uncertainty and sequestration. The committee, through rigorous oversight and legislative action, developed and implemented strategies to help mitigate cost growth and schedule delays, as well as enacted needed acquisition reform initiatives among all categories of acquisition programs to help streamline the overall development process. In particular, the committee has worked to ensure the military services have the appropriate authorities, capabilities, and force structure to defend

against any potential challenges posed by the advanced anti-access/area-denial, and multi-domain capabilities of countries such as the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

#### MARITIME AVIATION

The committee provided extensive oversight of the Navy's unmanned maritime programs and a new Navy program entitled Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike Systems (UCLASS). The Joint Explanatory Statement to Accompany S. 1356, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Committee Print No. 2), stated "that the Navy should develop a penetrating, air-refuelable, unmanned carrier-launched aircraft capable of performing a broad range of missions in a non-permissive environment." The Joint Explanatory Statement also included that "such an aircraft should be designed for full integration into carrier air wing operations—including strike operations—and possess the range, payload, and survivability attributes as necessary to complement such integration." The Joint Explanatory Statement also indicated support to obtain additional information as to the UCLASS program and the integration of this capability into overall carrier air wing.

The budget request for fiscal year 2017 included support for a new unmanned aviation program entitled MQ-25 to replace the UCLASS program. S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, supported MQ-25, but in the committee report (H. Rept. 114-537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee noted that "the Navy may be excluding a critical capability and precluding future growth in a platform that will likely be integrated into the carrier air wing for the next 30 years." The report also indicated "the committee continues to believe that the effectiveness of the carrier and its air wing would be enhanced by the development of an unmanned carrier-based aircraft capable of penetrating in a non-permissive environment and conducting strike."

#### ARMY AND MARINE CORPS ARMORED VEHICLE MODERNIZATION

During the 114th Congress, committee activity focused on providing oversight that would continue to ensure that the existing fleet of armored combat vehicles were upgraded and reset after very heavy use in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and that the Army and Marine Corps continued to develop and resource vehicle modernization strategies that are informed by realistic and affordable operational requirements, as well as incorporate requirements that address the evolving anti-vehicle threat posed by improvised explosive devices and advances in anti-tank guided missiles and rocket-propelled grenades. The committee's efforts centered on "restoring readiness" through near-term incremental modernization efforts that capitalize on acquisition reform initiatives to better streamline the development and fielding of solutions to the warfighter in a timely manner. Consistent with committee oversight activity from the 113th Congress, the committee also continued to assess and mitigate the impacts of

budget uncertainty and sequestration on the armored combat vehicle industrial base.

The committee devoted particular focus on the following Army and Marine Corps vehicle modernization program strategies: Amphibious Combat Vehicle Increment 1.1 program; Stryker Combat Vehicle lethality upgrade program; Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle program; Abrams Main Battle Tank program; Hercules Improved Recovery Vehicle program; the Bradley Fighting Vehicle program; and the initiation of the Army's mobile protected firepower development program to help "enhance the tactical mobility and lethality for infantry brigade combat teams."

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on March 19, 2015, on the budget request for fiscal year 2016 that addressed the effectiveness of Army and Marine Corps ground force and rotorcraft modernization programs, given the complex security environment: "Fiscal Year 2016 Ground Force Modernization and Rotorcraft Modernization Programs." The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also held two classified briefings that focused on combat vehicle modernization: June 25, 2015, "Current and Emerging Threats to U.S. Combat Vehicles"; and December 10, 2015, "The Future of Land Warfare and Combat Vehicle Modernization." For fiscal year 2017, the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on March 2, 2016, entitled "Army and Marine Corps Ground Force Modernization Programs and the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request" to review combat vehicle modernization efforts for the Army and Marine Corps. The subcommittee also held a hearing on February 10, 2016, entitled "The Recommendations from the National Commission on the Future of the Army," to review the Commission's findings and recommendations to include those associated with concerns related to equipment capability and capacity. The subcommittee held a briefing on June 8, 2016, on the Marine Corps Ground Combat Tactical Vehicle modernization strategy as a follow-on to the March 2nd hearing.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee required the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 30, 2016, on the potential force structure changes and production programs necessary to achieve a pure fleet of M1 Abrams tanks across the Army, and directed the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2016, on what the current and long-term plans are for modernizing the remaining Bradley Fighting Vehicles. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) authorized an additional \$40.0 million for Abrams Tank modifications to help sustain critical industrial bases for Forward Looking Infrared programs, as well as transmissions. Public Law 114-92 authorized an additional \$72.0 million for Hercules Improved Recovery Vehicles, an unfunded requirement identified by the Chief of Staff of the Army. Public Law 114-92 also authorized an additional \$411.0 million for lethality upgrades to improve the combat capability of Stryker Combat Vehicles currently deployed in Europe; this funding addressed an urgent operational need from forward deployed forces.

H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, included additional funding for several combat vehicle modernization programs to address unfunded requirements as identified by the Chief of Staff of the Army: an additional \$90 million for vehicle active protection systems to counter emerging threats, in particular for those vehicles operating in Europe; an additional \$72.0 million for Hercules Improved Recovery Vehicles; an additional \$60.0 million for continued Abrams tank modifications to help maintain critical sub-tier industrial base suppliers for transmissions and Forward Looking Infrared programs.

Both H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, contained legislation that would require the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to establish and maintain policy guidance regarding the establishment of, and updates to, fire suppressant and fuel containment standards for combat vehicles, an area of concern for members of the committee. Both H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, and S. 2943 provided legislation that would require an assessment on the ways, and associated costs, to reduce or eliminate shortfalls in responsiveness and capacity in several critical Army modernization capabilities, such as combat vehicles.

The staff of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also met with officials representing the Government Accountability Office to discuss areas for improvement in Army acquisition and processes requirements generation as part of the Army's overall combat vehicle modernization strategy. The staff also conducted oversight visits to each of the contractors' production facilities who are actively participating in the Marine Corps Amphibious Combat Vehicle program.

#### ARMY AND MARINE CORPS TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES

During the 114th Congress, the committee oversight activity on tactical wheeled vehicles (TWV) focused on the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program, the Ground Mobility Vehicle program, High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) recapitalization strategies, Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle divestment strategies, divestment strategies for all TWVs, and the consolidation of the TWV industrial base. Of particular interest to the committee was the JLTV program. The committee provided significant oversight on JLTV cost, schedule, and performance as the program transitioned from development into low-rate initial production. The committee also continued to coordinate with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) regarding the Department's efforts in the long-term management and sustainment of the TWV fleet and its associated industrial base.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces has engaged in oversight work with the GAO to begin a comprehensive review of the tactical wheeled vehicle industrial base. Furthermore, the subcommittee also closely monitored the Army's concept and way forward for improving combat capability of Infantry Brigade Combat Teams that would consist of developing and procuring three new combat tactical vehicles: the ground mobility vehicle, light-weight reconnaissance vehicle, and mobile protected firepower vehi-

cle programs. The committee has supported the Army's efforts for improving the tactical mobility and combat effectiveness of light infantry units and will continue to closely monitor these programs in the next Congress.

During the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held hearings and briefings on the budget request for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 that reviewed the effectiveness of Army and Marine Corps ground force and rotorcraft modernization programs against current and future threats, as well as provided oversight on current acquisition strategies, to include tactical wheeled vehicles such as the JLTV and HMMWV recapitalization programs.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) authorized the President's budget request for the JLTV program. Both H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2017, required the implementation of new policy guidance regarding the establishment of, and updates to, fire suppressant and fuel containment standards that meet survivability requirements across various classes of tactical wheeled vehicles. Both H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, and S. 2943 provided an additional \$50.0 million for new production HMMWV ambulances, a critical requirement for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard.

#### ARMY AVIATION PROGRAMS

During the 114th Congress, legacy rotorcraft platforms, including the CH-47, UH-60, and AH-64, continued to be operated at high operational tempos in very challenging environments. As a result of these high operational tempos, continued upgrade and reset efforts were required for these legacy platforms. The committee focused oversight efforts on the need to continue to upgrade and reset these critical equipment platforms for both the Active and Reserve Components through formal activities and legislative action. The committee activity during the 114th Congress built on the actions from the 113th Congress. With respect to rotorcraft programs, oversight activities focused on the Army's Aviation Restructure Initiative (ARI); unfunded requirements for Army and Marine Corps rotorcraft modernization; and the continued need for upgraded aircraft survivability equipment (ASE), in particular ASE for those rotorcraft engaged in Operation Inherent Resolve. The committee also conducted oversight on the initiation of modernization programs, such as the Joint Future Vertical Lift program, as well as the critical need to rapidly develop and field advanced aircraft survivability equipment upgrades to provide warning and protection against evolving surface-to-air missile threats.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on the budget request for fiscal year 2016 to address the effectiveness of Army and Marine Corps ground force and rotorcraft modernization programs, given the complex security environment. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a classified briefing on June 18, 2015, to gain a better understanding of the current and future threats facing U.S. rotorcraft. On March 16, 2016, the subcommittee held a hearing on Department of Defense

rotorcraft modernization programs to conduct oversight on the budget request, and covered additional issues such as the Army's ARI, the requirements for rotorcraft survivability equipment and degraded visual environment technology, the Marine Corps V-22 tiltrotor program, and the Air Force's strategy to replace the UH-1N rotorcraft currently used for security at nuclear sites and complexes. The subcommittee also held a hearing on the recommendations from the National Commission of the Future of the Army, where the Commission's recommendations regarding the Army's ARI were discussed in detail. Based on this hearing, the committee concurred with the Commission's recommendation regarding the ARI, which would retain some AH-64 Apache attack helicopters in the Army National Guard, as well as noted the requirement to permanently station a combat aviation brigade in Korea, as well as in Europe.

H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as passed by the House, authorized an additional \$95.5 million to accelerate an additional 8 UH-60A to UH-60L conversions for the Army National Guard. In the committee report (H. Rept. 114-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee also noted the maturity of the current AH-64E production line and future year requirements encouraged the Secretary of the Army to seek congressional approval of a multiyear contract award in the fiscal year 2017 budget request for AH-64E Apache Attack helicopters. Such a multiyear contract could potentially save over a hundred million dollars over a 5-year period.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) included section 111 that required the Chief, National Guard Bureau to issue guidance within 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Act that prioritized UH-60 helicopter upgrades within the Army National Guard to those units with the highest flight hour aircraft and highest utilization rates. Public Law 114-92 included section 113 that required the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, that contained detailed options for the potential acceleration of the replacement of all UH-60A helicopters of the Army National Guard. Public Law 114-92 authorized an additional \$128.0 million for 8 additional UH-60M Black Hawks for the Army National Guard. Public Law 114-92 authorized an additional \$110.0 million that addressed an Army unfunded requirement for improved countermeasures to better protect deployed AH-64E helicopters against the latest and most lethal threats. Public Law 114-92 included section 1054 that limited transfers of certain AH-64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the regular Army.

H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, included legislation informed by subcommittee activity to include: authorized multiyear procurement (MYP) contract authority for AH-64 Apache attack helicopters, and UH-60M and HH-60M Black Hawk utility helicopters, and also authorized a study by a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) on technologies with the potential to prevent and mitigate helicopter crashes. H.R. 4909, as

passed by the House, also included additional funding to address unfunded requirements as identified by the Chief of Staff of the Army, Commandant of the Marine Corps, and Chief of Staff of the Air Force: an additional \$440.2 million for 36 UH-60M helicopters; an additional \$190.0 million for 5 AH-64E helicopters; an additional \$110.0 million for 17 UH-72 light utility helicopters; an additional \$72.0 million for CH-47 Chinook heavy lift helicopter modifications; an additional \$150.0 million for 2 V-22 tilt rotorcraft to prevent a break in the current multiyear procurement contract; and an additional \$80.0 million for the Air Force UH-1N replacement program. H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, also provided an additional \$180.7 million for rotorcraft survivability equipment.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would authorize MYP contract authority for AH-64Es, UH-60Ms, and HH-60Ms. S.2943 would also authorize the FFRDC study on technologies with the potential to prevent or mitigate helicopter crashes. S. 2943 authorized an additional \$13.3 million for rotorcraft survivability equipment.

#### ARMY COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMS

Given the growing importance of battlefield communications networks in global combat operations, the committee continued to aggressively monitor the Army's plans for its future battlefield network and the supporting research programs now in place, to include rigorous oversight of the Army's Tactical Network Modernization roadmap. From an Army communications perspective, the focus of committee activity during the 114th Congress remained on ensuring full and open competition for Army communication and network programs, working to ensure innovation and timely improvements to legacy systems, and reviewing the acquisition strategy for the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T) program.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on the budget request for fiscal year 2016 to address the effectiveness of Army and Marine Corps ground force and rotorcraft modernization programs, given the complex security environment. The subcommittee held a hearing, "Army and Marine Corps Ground Force Modernization Programs and the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request" where Army and Marine Corps tactical network and communications program were reviewed in detail, specifically the Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form Fit Radio (HMS), the Mid-Tier Networking Vehicular Radio (MNVR) program, and the WIN-T program.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee continued to support the Army's larger vision of a radio marketplace that drives innovation and technology improvement over the course of the program. The committee also supported moving forward with an accelerated competition for both the dismounted and mounted versions of the Manpack radio and driving to produce improvements through the planned delivery order competition.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) included section 237 that required a federally

funded research and development center to conduct a comprehensive assessment of current and future requirements and capabilities of the Army with respect to air-land ad hoc, mobile tactical communications and data networks, including the technological feasibility, suitability, and survivability of such networks.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Defense Technology Security Administration to provide a briefing on the potential use of new radio waveforms for tactical communications that may be available via a non-developmental item acquisition approach, and the potential effects of U.S. Government policy changes on this industrial sector and on the ability of warfighters and our international partners to access innovative radio technologies. The committee also noted its support for the goals of the MNVR program and noted the importance of modernizing battlefield communications as a critical priority for the Army. The committee encouraged the Army to maintain its testing schedule and, if testing proves successful, its production schedule in order to meet fielding requirements.

#### ORGANIZATIONAL CLOTHING AND INDIVIDUAL EQUIPMENT

The committee continued to devote substantial attention to the oversight of the research, development, and procurement of organizational clothing and individual equipment and other complementary personal protective equipment programs during the 114th Congress. The committee focused efforts primarily on the Army's soldier protection system, small arms modernization strategies and associated industrial base, modular handgun system, enhanced small caliber ammunition programs, as well as ongoing weight reduction and acquisition strategies for personal protective equipment (PPE).

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on the budget request for fiscal year 2016 that addressed the effectiveness of Army and Marine Corps ground force and rotorcraft modernization programs, given the complex security environment. The subcommittee held a hearing on Army and Marine Corps Ground Force Modernization Programs and the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request where issues related to Army and Marine Corps individual equipment were discussed in detail such as: weight reduction efforts for PPE, PPE specifically designed for female soldiers and marines, advances in combat helmet technology, the modular handgun system test and evaluation program, and standardizing enhanced small caliber ammunition between the Army and Marine Corps.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee continued to highlight the importance of modernizing and reducing weight for PPE and small arms. The committee continued to encourage and recommend a weapon system approach to PPE acquisition, in particular body armor, with an established procurement line item for PPE that could improve the performance of these systems through more enhanced integration efforts. The committee continued to encourage the Department of Defense (DOD) to

take the necessary actions to maintain at least two vendors as part of the PPE critical industrial base for hard and soft armor components. In H. Rept. 114–102, the committee also directed the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the senior military services acquisition executives, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the current state of the small arms production industrial base.

As a result of rigorous oversight activity performed by the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, to include meetings with senior DOD and military officials as well as industry coalitions regarding PPE acquisition reform measures, H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as passed by the House, included section 860 that required the Secretary of Defense to use to the maximum extent practicable best value contracting strategies instead of lowest price, technically acceptable strategies for PPE acquisition. H.R. 1735, as passed by the House, also required the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, regarding the current use of two different types of 5.56mm ammunition in combat by the Army and the Marine Corps.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included section 884 that ensured best value criteria is used to the maximum extent practicable for PPE. Public Law 114–92 authorized the budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Army's Soldier Protection System, and authorized full funding for Department of Defense PPE programs. Public Law 114–92 required the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of the Navy to jointly submit a report to the congressional defense committees on Army and Marine Corps modernization plans for small arms. Public Law 114–92 also required a study on the use of different types of enhanced small caliber ammunition by the Army and Marine Corps.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee supported the advancement of the development and procurement of lighter, stronger, and more advanced PPE systems for all soldiers, while also ensuring women entering combat roles are fully and correctly equipped. The committee also directed a briefing on the plans to improve current body armor and PPE systems, as well as consider the specific needs of female warfighters, and required the Comptroller General of the United States to review all Department of Defense individual equipment initiatives being resourced to help “lighten the warfighters load.”

H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, included legislation that required the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Army and the Marine Corps are using one standard type of enhanced 5.56mm rifle ammunition in combat, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Act. H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, also provided an additional \$22.0 million for Marine Corps enhanced combat helmets, fully funding an unfunded requirement as identified by the Commandant of the Marine Corps. H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, also included legislation that required the Army and Marine Corps to develop a joint acquisition strategy for

PPE and organizational clothing and individual equipment specifically designed to meet the unique physical requirements of female service members.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would require the Secretary of Defense to standardize enhanced 5.56mm small caliber ammunition for the Army and Marine Corps.

#### FIGHTER FORCE STRUCTURE

During the 114th Congress, the committee continued to investigate the adequacy of fighter force structure in both the Navy and the Air Force. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on these issues on March 26, 2015: “Combat Aviation Modernization Program and the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request.” The Navy witness testified that F/A-18A/B/C/D aircraft are reaching the end of their projected service life and will require replacement or modifications to further extend their service life to eventual deployment of the F-35 aircraft. The witness noted that the Department of the Navy’s strike fighter shortfall is projected to reach 134 aircraft in 2020. Also at the hearing on March 26, 2015, the Air Force witness testified to an Air Force requirement for 1,900 fighter aircraft, but fiscal constraints resulted in a need to retire fighter aircraft leaving the Air Force significantly below its requirement of 1,900 fighter aircraft. The Air Force noted that it planned to retire about 164 A-10 aircraft in fiscal year 2016. To maintain remaining force structure, Air Force officials informed the subcommittee that any shortfall mitigation will include: executing funded sustainment and fleet management actions for older F-16 Block 25, 30, and 32 aircraft; newer block 40 and 50 service life extension; and targeted modernization and examination of the overall force structure to ensure viable warfighting capabilities are maintained.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also held a hearing on the F-35 program on April 14, 2015: “Update on the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Program and the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request.” For fiscal year 2017, the subcommittee held a hearing on February 4, 2016, “Naval Strike Fighters: Issues and Concerns”; a hearing on March 23, 2016, “Update on the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Program and the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request”; a field hearing at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base on June 18, 2016, “Air Dominance and the Critical Role of Fifth Generation Fighters”; a follow-on hearing to the aforementioned field hearing on July 13, 2016, “Air Dominance and the Critical Role of Fifth Generation Fighters.”

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) authorized an increase of 12 F/A-18F aircraft for the Navy, an increase of 6 F-35B aircraft for the Marine Corps, and the requested procurement to extend the life of the legacy F/A-18 and AV-8B fleets. Public Law 114-92 also authorized the entire Air Force request for modifications to its A-10, F-15, F-16, F-22A, and F-35 fleets, and included a provision that prohibited the Air Force from retiring any A-10 aircraft until after December 31, 2016, but allowed only 18 A-10 aircraft to be placed into back-up inventory status. Additionally, Public Law 114-92 authorized the

budget request of \$9.2 billion for 57 F-35 aircraft and \$1.9 billion for F-35 development.

H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, included legislation that would prevent retirements of A-10 aircraft, but would allow the Secretary of the Air Force to transition the A-10 unit at Fort Wayne Air National Guard Base, Indiana, to an F-16 unit in fiscal year 2018, as the Secretary had proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2017. H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, provided an additional \$1.4 billion for 11 additional F-35 aircraft to address unfunded requirements identified by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Chief of Naval Operations, and Commandant of the Marine Corps. H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, also provided an additional \$1.4 billion for 14 additional F/A-18 E/F Super Hornets.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, similar to H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, would prevent retirements of A-10 aircraft, but would allow the Secretary of the Air Force to transition the A-10 unit at Fort Wayne Air National Guard Base, Indiana, to an F-16 unit in fiscal year 2018, as the Secretary had proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2017, and also requires Government Accountability Office to assess the conclusions and assertions contained in the Secretary and Chief of Staff's report on the F-35A Initial Operational Test and Evaluation. S. 2943 would also prohibit the availability of funds for the Air Force to be obligated for the purpose of scrapping, destroying, or otherwise disposing of any A-10 aircraft in any storage status in the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Group that have serviceable wings or other components that could be used to prevent total active inventory A-10 aircraft from being permanently removed from flyable status due to unserviceable wings or other components.

#### F-35

During the 114th Congress, the committee continued oversight of the F-35 program.

At a hearing on April 14, 2015, before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, "Update on the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Program and the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request," the Government Accountability Office (GAO) Director of Acquisition and Sourcing testified that technical challenges in 2014 forced the Department of Defense to make unexpected changes to its development and testing plans, and that key challenges affecting the program were a structural failure on the F-35B durability test aircraft, an engine failure, and higher-than-expected amount of test growth largely to address software rework. The GAO witness also noted that F-35 system reliability has been limited by poor engine reliability, which will take additional time and resources to achieve reliability goals. The GAO witness additionally noted that affordability remains the biggest challenge facing the program since annual procurement costs are expected to rise from \$14 to \$15 billion, and remain at that level for nearly a decade, while other significant fiscal demands weigh on the Department of Defense and the Nation.

On June 23, 2014, an F-35A stationed at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, had a serious flight mishap resulting from an engine failure and fire. The cause of the engine failure and fire was determined to be excessive rubbing between an engine stator and adjacent plate seals. The F-35 Joint Program Office and the engine manufacturer have identified both short-term and long-term corrections to this problem. The flight test schedule has been minimally affected. The committee continues to monitor both the short-term and long-term corrections to F-35 engines.

Members of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also participated in a congressional delegation to Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, to receive briefings, interact with F-35 pilots and maintenance personnel, and to observe F-35 operations on March 27, 2015. Among other issues, committee Members noted significant unit-level problems with the maturity and accuracy of the F-35 autonomic logistics information system, a system which is used to determine the F-35's maintenance status and direct required maintenance actions.

With some minor reductions, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92), authorized the budget request of \$9.2 billion for 57 F-35 aircraft and \$1.9 billion for F-35 development, and provided an increase of \$846.0 million for 6 additional F-35B aircraft for the Marine Corps. Public Law 114-92 also included a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the F-35's engine program that will include an assessment of the reliability, growth and cost history of the engine; and a thorough assessment of the F-35 engine fire on June 23, 2014. Additionally, Public Law 114-92 included a provision requiring the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on the F-35 autonomic logistics information system that includes fielding status, development schedule, views of maintenance personnel, the effect of the autonomic logistics information system on F-35 operational availability, the ability of the autonomic logistics information system to be deployed on ships and land-based locations, and costs for developing and fielding the system.

On June 18, 2016, and July 13, 2016, the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held hearings both entitled, "Air Dominance and the Critical Role of Fifth Generation Fighter Aircraft." The witnesses in these two hearings informed the committee that near-peer adversaries were closing a fighter aircraft capability and capacity gap with U.S. forces, and that the currently planned procurement rate of 48 F-35A aircraft per year would not be sufficient to address Department of the Air Force fighter aircraft shortfalls and requirements.

H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, contained legislation that directed the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an analysis of the sustainment support strategy for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program. H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, also included an additional \$1.4 billion for 11 additional F-35 Joint Strike Fighters to address unfunded requirements as identified by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, contains legislation that would: require the Secretary of Defense, no later than March 31, 2017, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on potential options for the future management of the Joint Strike Fighter program; require the Secretary of Defense, not later than March 31, 2017, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report that contains the basic elements of an acquisition program baseline for F-35 JSF Block 4 follow-on modernization program; and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an analysis of the sustainment support strategy for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program.

#### BOMBER FORCE STRUCTURE

The committee continues to maintain rigorous oversight of our nation's bomber fleet. With regard to B-21 force structure, the committee report (H. Rept. 114-537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 directed the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2017, that estimates the number of B-21 bomber aircraft needed to meet the combatant commanders' requirements. The report, which may include a classified annex, shall include: a detailed explanation of the strategy and associated force-sizing-and-shaping-constructs, associated scenarios and assumptions used to conduct the analysis; a range of numbers to meet requirements for B-21 bombers given best-case and worst-case assumptions, and the associated risk based on Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff risk management classifications; and a detailed transition plan that integrates the B-21 into the current bomber fleet through 2040. Additionally, section 238 of S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, requires the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a semiannual report to the congressional defense committees and the Comptroller General of the United States on the B-21 bomber aircraft program.

With regard to overall bomber force structure, section 150 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) required the Secretary of the Air Force to notify Congress of any proposed bomber retirements as well as the rationale for such retirement, the effects of the retirement, and how the Secretary will mitigate any risks relating to the retirement.

As to B-21, the committee notes that the Secretary of the Air Force has proposed significant investments for technology development and engineering, manufacturing and development. In the budget request for fiscal year 2016, the administration requested \$1.25 billion to support B-21. However, Public Law 114-92 authorized \$566.2 million, as a result of a late contract award. The budget request for fiscal year 2017 included \$1.36 billion and was fully authorized in S. 2943. The committee will maintain aggressive oversight of the new bomber acquisition strategy to ensure that the Air Force develops an affordable aircraft to timely meet future requirements.

With regard to legacy bombers, the committee continues to ensure that the Air Force maintains, modernizes, and upgrades the existing fleet of bomber aircraft in order to preserve effective capabilities needed to meet current and future threat target sets. Public

Law 114-92 and S. 2943 authorized the modernization funds requested by Air Force for the B-1, B-2, and B-52 aircraft. The committee will continue to maintain oversight of current bomber aircraft inventory requirements and modernization plans to ensure that the Air Force maintains a sufficient, credible, and lethal fixed-wing aircraft with conventional and strategic weapons delivery capability to support all aspects of the national military strategy.

#### AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT

During the 114th Congress, the committee maintained active oversight of Air Force aerial refueling aircraft modernization and recapitalization programs. Until the KC-46A is operational and procured in sufficient numbers, the KC-135 and KC-10 will remain the primary providers of U.S. air-refueling. As such, the committee included section 146 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92), which placed a prohibition on the availability of funds for retirement of KC-10 aircraft with few exceptions to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force. Additionally, the committee supported the Secretary of the Air Force's efforts to modernize the avionics of the KC-10 fleet of tankers to maintain relevant and effective aerial refueling capabilities by fully funding the Air Force's modernization request.

With regard to the KC-135 fleet, limited fiscal resources are available to the Air Force for recapitalization of all 395 aircraft, necessitating the continued maintenance and operation of legacy aircraft. Consequently, the committee supported the Secretary of the Air Force's efforts to modernize avionics of the KC-135 fleet by fully funding the Air Force's modernization request in Public Law 114-92 and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. Furthermore, the committee continues to provide aggressive extensive oversight intended to ensure the timely and efficient recapitalization of the Air Force's KC-135 tanker fleet with new KC-46 aerial refueling aircraft. As such, the committee supports the Secretary of the Air Force's continued investment in this program.

#### INTERTHEATER AND INTRATHEATER AIRLIFT

The committee provided close oversight of Air Force intertheater and intratheater airlift aircraft inventories and capabilities to ensure that a robust and effective fleet of airlift aircraft is maintained in the Air Force inventory to meet all mobility airlift requirements of the Department of Defense. Regarding intertheater airlift aircraft capabilities, the committee included section 147 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92), which restricted funds for transfer of C-130H aircraft. This restriction applies until 90 days after the Air Force and Army jointly certify to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives that they have met the requirements required in section 147.

Additionally, the committee is concerned about the Air Force's plans to adequately fund C-130H modernization programs that are critical to ensuring the future utility of this aircraft. Accordingly, Public Law 114-92 and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, authorized additional funds for C-

130 AMP, C-130H Electric Prop Control System, C-130H In-flight Prop Balancing System, Eight Bladed Propeller, and the T-56 3.5 Engine Mod.

#### SURFACE WARFARE PROGRAMS

The committee continues its oversight of the Department of Defense's shipbuilding programs to ensure balanced investments are made and the Navy achieves the force structure, with appropriate capabilities, needed to meet requirements. Through its oversight activities, the committee faces the challenge of balancing current demands on an aging fleet within current economic constraints. As of December 15, 2015, the Navy indicated they currently support 272 deployable battle force ships. This available force structure contrasts the Navy's 2013 requirements projection of 308 ships and the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel requirement of 346 ships. Despite these shortfalls, the committee seeks to obtain the required capability and provide stability to the shipbuilding industrial base.

Preeminent in the Navy force structure is the aircraft carrier, which represents the embodiment of the United States' ability to project power. The Navy has developed a new aircraft carrier design and is in the final construction of the lead ship for the *Ford*-class aircraft carriers. Technologies introduced with the USS *Gerald R. Ford* have challenged the Navy to maintain cost controls on the lead ship and subsequent ships. To address these cost issues, section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) included a provision that amended section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) by requiring the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations to certify design and engineering changes in excess of \$5.0 million. Furthermore, section 122 of Public Law 114-92 was also included, which amended section 122 of Public Law 109-364 and reduced the cost limitation for the aircraft carrier designated as CVN-79 by \$100.0 million to \$11.40 billion.

The Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces also continues its oversight of the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program. Section 123 of Public Law 114-92 included a provision that would restrict funding associated with LCS-25 and LCS-26 until: (1) the Navy provides certain reports about the LCS program; and (2) the Joint Requirements Oversight Council makes certain certifications about the LCS program. Section 123 of S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would require additional reports on LCS Mission Packages and a restriction from deviating from revision three of the LCS acquisition strategy until the Secretary of Defense provides a certification.

Finally, the Joint Explanatory Statement to accompany S. 1356, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Committee Print No. 2), indicated that "the lack of fiscal support in the fiscal year 2016 FYDP [Future Years Defense Program] and previous requests for the early retirement of some of these cruisers has led the conferees to question the administration's resolve to retain all of these cruisers through the end of their service lives." To address this concern, section 1024 of Public Law 114-92 and sec-

tion 1024 of S. 2943 would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds associated with the retirement, inactivation, or storage of *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers and *Whidbey Island*-class amphibious ships.

#### UNDERSEA WARFARE PROGRAMS

The committee conducted rigorous oversight of the Navy's undersea warfare domain and placed increased emphasis on a new program that will be used to replace the current fleet of ballistic missile submarines. This replacement submarine program, SSBN(X), is projected to cost over \$1.00 billion for the design and construction of the 12 submarines and will be the second largest Department of Defense acquisition program. Considering this program is expected to support 70 percent of the nation's strategic deterrence capability, the committee is resolved to acquiring the 12 submarines and is supportive of authorizing an efficient contract for the construction of the SSBN(X) program. Section 1022 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) established a fund called the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund to manage the allocations of monies to support the SSBN(X) program. Section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) expanded the fund and provided additional authority to enter into economic order quantities for common components with other nuclear powered vessels that the Congressional Budget Office has indicated would save several hundred million dollars for each submarine. This section also provided special transfer authority to the Department of Defense to support this program. In the committee report (H. Rept. 114-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee required a report from the Comptroller General of the United States that would assess the technical maturity of the SSBN(X) program before to assure the committee that a stable design is obtained before SSBN(X) construction is started. Finally, section 1023 of S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would provide an authorization for multiyear procurement of critical components to support continuous production of the Common Missile Compartment.

#### MANNED AND UNMANNED INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS

Manned and unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) system programs have come to constitute a significant component of the overall Department of Defense force structure. The capability provided by these assets is critical to sustaining deterrence and warfighting capability of U.S. forces. The committee has continued to focus on the budget, cost, schedule, and performance outcomes of major manned and unmanned aerial systems programs and examine the ISR enterprise for balance in collection and analysis capabilities. Also, close scrutiny of Office of the Secretary of Defense ISR policy formulation and oversight has been and will continue to be of interest to the committee. Long-standing concerns of the committee remain: lack of an adequate long-term ISR architecture and acquisition strategy; lack of supporting analysis for programmatic decisions; failure to balance collection programs data

output with adequate resources to process, exploit, and disseminate data and analysis; and unnecessary proliferation of manned and unmanned vehicles and sensors. The committee expects the Joint Staff and Joint Requirements Oversight Council to take a more active role in coordinating ISR system acquisition and coordinating employment with the combatant commanders.

In the first session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on March 26, 2015, on Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force combat aviation programs: “Combat Aviation Modernization Programs and the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request.” Witnesses for this hearing included the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition; Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps for Aviation; Director of the Navy Air Warfare Division; Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition; and the Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Requirements. Among other issues, this hearing reviewed the Department of Defense budget requests for unmanned aerial systems for fiscal year 2016, including the requests for the RQ-4 Global Hawk and MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial systems, and the U-2.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) authorized one additional RQ-4 Global Hawk unmanned air system over the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2016, the budget request for the U-2, and added \$150.0 million for additional MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial systems. Public Law 114-92 also included a provision that prohibits the Department of the Air Force from retiring any E-8C Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System and E-3C Airborne Warning and Control System aircraft in fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, prohibited the availability of funds for retirement of Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft in fiscal year 2018. H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, also prohibited the availability of funds for retirement of U-2 surveillance aircraft. H.R. 4909, as passed by the House, also included an additional \$95.0 million for one additional Navy Triton Unmanned Aerial System; an additional \$95.1 million for critical upgrades to the Army’s MQ-1C improved Gray Eagle UAS platforms; and an additional \$35.0 million for Air Force MQ-9 Reaper UAS auto take-off and landing capability.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, would prohibit the availability of funds for retirement of JSTARS aircraft in fiscal year 2018; and limit the availability of fiscal year 2017 and coming year funds for the JSTARS recapitalization program unless the contract for engineering and manufacturing development uses a firm fixed-price contract structure or the Secretary of Defense waives the limitation in the national security interests of the United States. S. 2943 also would require the Air Force to transfer the operation of a significant number of remotely piloted aircraft to enlisted personnel by September 30, 2020, for the Active Duty Component, and by September 30, 2023, as the required date for transition by the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard.

## EMERGING ADVANCED WEAPONS CAPABILITIES

Department of Defense investment in science and technology often leads to the development of new advanced weapons capabilities that contribute to the technological superiority of U.S. military forces. Maintaining technology overmatch of current and potential adversaries is a significant part of the qualitative advantage of U.S. forces, but is increasingly difficult in an environment of globalized technologies and asymmetric combinations of high-tech and low-tech capabilities. The committee continued to monitor technological developments and support transition of the most promising ones, such as directed energy, hypersonics, and autonomy.

In the 114th Congress, the committee has closely examined organizing concepts provided by the military services and the Office of Secretary of Defense as demonstration projects become viable programs, and the respective services develop acquisition plans in support of fielding directed energy capabilities. Additionally, the committee has expanded its focus to take a similar look at other emerging advanced weapons capabilities, such as hypersonics and autonomy, to see how they can contribute to new security strategies, and to ensure that they are supported by rigorous technical analysis and relevant concepts of employment.

The committee held related hearings and briefings, including: a hearing on November 19, 2015, “Advancing the Science and Acceptance of Autonomy for Future Defense Systems”; a briefing on December 16, 2015, “Defense Science Board Report on 21st Century Military Operations in a Complex Electromagnetic Environment.”

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: an assessment of the directed energy industrial base; a review of the combatant commander requirements for directed energy weapons; a review by the Comptroller General of the measures and actions being taken to mitigate the loss of access to current sources of trusted microelectronics; a review by the Comptroller General of technology transition activities within the Department of Defense; and a review of the transition of technologies from the Strategic Capabilities Office.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included a provision that would require a plan for advanced technology war games; a provision that would extend authorization for the Rapid Innovation Program; a provision that would establish a cooperative research and development program with Israel to develop anti-tunneling defense capabilities; a provision that would authorize a technology offset fund; and a provision that would establish a pilot program for streamlining awards for innovative technology programs.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: a briefing on the plan for demonstrating and deploying a common railgun mount; a briefing on Air Force directed energy initiatives; a briefing on a technology roadmap for addressing gaps to counter the potential threats from terrorist or state actor uses of small un-

manned aerial systems; a briefing on a technology roadmap for enabling technology needed for operational directed energy weapon systems; and a briefing assessing the test range needs and investments to meet testing required for fifth and sixth generation aircraft and air armament, including hypersonic strike weapons.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes a provision that would require notification for the use of certain funds for prototyping and experimentation in the Navy; a provision that would require the designation of a senior defense official with principal responsibility for directed energy weapons, and redesignate an office to serve as the Joint Directed Energy Transition Office to improve the rapid fielding of directed energy systems; a provision that would establish a pilot program for the modernization of electromagnetic spectrum warfare systems and electronic warfare systems; and a provision that would require a report on future electronic warfare concepts and technologies.

#### NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

In the 114th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy and the nuclear policies and programs of the Department of Defense to ensure the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the U.S. nuclear deterrent. Particular emphasis has been placed on Department of Energy and Department of Defense nuclear modernization plans, including but not limited to infrastructure investments, warhead life extension programs, stockpile stewardship and management plans, delivery system modernization, nuclear command and control, cost savings and efficiency initiatives, and security.

In the first session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on March 24, 2015, on the “Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense” and a hearing on April 15, 2015, on the “Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Nuclear Forces.” Respectively, these hearings examined the nuclear-related budget requests for the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense.

On October 7, 2015, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on “Plutonium Disposition and the MOX Project,” to examine in detail the largest construction project taking place within the Department of Energy’s Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program. On November 3, 2015, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on “Future Options for the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent—Views from Project Atom.” This hearing featured nongovernmental expert witnesses and focused on discussion of long-term plans and programs for the U.S. nuclear deterrent.

On June 25, 2015, the full committee held a hearing on “Nuclear Deterrence in the 21st Century,” with witnesses that included the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Energy, and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This hearing was the culmination of a focused “Nuclear Oversight Week” conducted by the full committee, which also included a hearing by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on June 25, 2015, consisting of an “Update on Findings and Recommendations of the 2014 Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise Review.” The com-

mittee's Nuclear Oversight Week also included a classified briefing for the full committee on June 24, 2015, on foreign nuclear weapon programs and capabilities and a classified briefing for the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on June 16, 2015, on the health and vitality of the nuclear weapon stockpile, systems, and enterprise.

In addition, during the first session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces conducted other classified briefings, including: (1) on January 27, 2015, a briefing on the Russian Federation's nuclear doctrine and capabilities; (2) on October 22, 2015, a joint briefing with the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on security of U.S. nuclear forces and implementation of recommendations of the Nuclear Enterprise Review; and (3) on November 17, 2015, a briefing on the status of the nuclear command, control, and communications system.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), included several legislative provisions related to nuclear deterrence and the nuclear security enterprise. This includes provisions to improve accountability and transparency of nuclear-related programs, enable cost savings within certain procurement programs, improve the responsiveness of nuclear weapons programs within the Department of Energy, track the implementation of reforms to governance and management of the nuclear security enterprise, and place limits or provide policy direction to certain programs.

In the second session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on January 12, 2016, on the “National Academies Study on Peer Review and Design Competition in the National Nuclear Security Administration’s National Security Laboratories” to review the results of this congressionally mandated study. The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces also held hearings on February 11, 2016, on the “Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense,” and on March 2, 2016, on the “Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for Department of Defense Nuclear Forces.” Respectively, these hearings examined the nuclear-related budget requests for the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense.

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces also held a hearing on July 14, 2016, on “President Obama’s Nuclear Deterrent Modernization Plans and Budgets” to review and conduct oversight of President Obama’s nuclear weapons modernization plans, budgets, and schedules—and the military requirements driving them. And on September 7, 2016, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on “Deferred Maintenance in the Nuclear Security Enterprise: Safety and Mission Risks” to review and assess the state of, and recapitalization plans for, infrastructure and facilities within the National Nuclear Security Administration’s nuclear security enterprise.

In addition, during the second session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces conducted other classified briefings, including: (1) on February 2, 2016, a briefing on proliferation threats from 3-D printing; and (2) on March 22, 2016, a briefing on fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes several legislative provisions related to nuclear deterrence and the nuclear security enterprise. This includes provisions that would improve processes and adopt best practices within nuclear-related programs; place limits or provide policy direction to certain programs; and authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to take certain actions to protect facilities and assets from threats posed by unmanned aircraft.

#### MISSILE DEFENSE

The committee oversees the Department of Defense's efforts to develop, test, and field layered missile defense capabilities to protect the United States, its deployed forces, and its friends and allies against the full range of ballistic missile threats. Particular emphasis will be placed on U.S. homeland missile defense capabilities (including the Missile Defense Agency's proposal and strategy for acquiring a Redesigned Kill Vehicle), European Phased Adaptive Approach implementation, continued implementation of other regional Phased Adaptive Approaches, ensuring an adequate hedging strategy for the protection of the U.S. homeland, developmental and operational testing, force structure and inventory requirements, sensor-to-shooter integration, and science and technology investments in areas such as directed energy. In the 114th Congress, the committee closely watched the administration's funding of the missile defense program, seeking the cost-effective application of resources, and looking for opportunities to enhance stability of the industrial base.

The committee will continue to monitor foreign ballistic missile threats and identify opportunities to strengthen international missile defense cooperation with allies and partners such as the State of Israel, Japan, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Republic of Korea, and North Atlantic Treaty Organization member states. Department of Defense oversight and management of missile defense activities, including the roles, responsibilities, and acquisition policies and procedures of the Missile Defense Agency and military services will also be reviewed. The committee will also provide oversight of the administration's missile defense policy and posture, including close examination of any administration efforts that may limit missile defenses as part of a treaty or agreement, and implications for United States, regional, global security and strategic stability.

The committee also intends to pay particular attention to the Army's Patriot air and missile defense program. The Army's plans call for significant investment over a long term and the committee will ensure these plans are cost-effective, based on proven technology, support continued Foreign Military Sales, and provide maximum deployable capability to combatant commanders and the warfighter.

During the first session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing regarding the "Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs." The Director of the Missile Defense Agency, Commander of U.S. Northern Command, and other subject matter experts all testified.

In addition the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces met for classified briefings on missile defense programs and adversary threats. On March 3, 2015, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on next-generation missile defense technology and capability, and on June 2, 2015, the subcommittee met for a classified briefing regarding missile defense programs.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), included several legislative provisions supporting the Ground-based Midcourse Defense and Redesigned Kill Vehicle programs, missile defense cooperation with Israel, and the Aegis Ashore program. Additional provisions established prohibitions on the integration of missile defense systems with systems made by either the Russian Federation or the People’s Republic of China.

During the second session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing regarding “The Missile Defeat Posture and Strategy of the United States—the FY17 President’s Budget Request.” The Director of the Missile Defense Agency, Commander of U.S. Northern Command, and several other experts testified in support of the President’s fiscal year 2017 budget request.

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces also held two classified briefings on missile defense threats and capabilities. On March 16, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on cruise missile defense—red vs. blue missile threat, and on June 9, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on Joint Capability Mix study IV—missile defense employment scenarios.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, contains numerous legislative provisions to include an amendment to the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–38), a mandate to the Missile Defense Agency to create a program of record for defending against hypersonic boost glide vehicles, direction to the Secretary of Defense for developing a left-of-launch declaratory policy, and additional prohibitions to the sharing of missile defense information and systems.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE

In the 114th Congress, the committee continued to oversee the national security space programs of the Department of Defense, including the combat support agencies and elements of the Department of Defense that are part of the Intelligence Community. The committee placed particular attention on assured access to space; space acquisition strategies; mitigating risks that could create gaps in space capabilities for key warfighter needs; providing affordability and increasing government buying power; and appropriately leveraging commercial satellite services.

The committee also continued to monitor foreign space threats and assessed the Department’s space security and defense program concerning space situational awareness, space protection, space control, and operationally responsive space activities. The committee provided oversight of the administration’s space policy, posture, and any related international agreements. Renewed attention was also placed on efforts to improve governance and management across the national security space enterprise.

In the first session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on March 17, 2015, on “Assuring Assured Access to Space.” The hearing consisted of two panels with witnesses from government and industry. The hearing focused on the current state and strategy for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program, including challenges, opportunities, and perspectives related to our national security space launch activities.

On March 25, 2015, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on the “Fiscal Year 2016 National Security Space Activities.” Senior government leaders served as witnesses for the hearing which focused on the fiscal year 2016 budget request for the Department of Defense in the context of the posture of national security space. The subcommittee also met in a closed session, following the open hearing, to receive further classified details regarding national security space investments and strategies.

On June 26, 2015, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on “Assuring National Security Space: Investing in American Industry to End Reliance on Russian Rocket Engines.” Witnesses from government and industry testified on the necessary investments in the U.S. industrial base and the planned acquisition strategy to develop a U.S. rocket propulsion system to end reliance on Russia. The hearing highlighted the risks, opportunities, and perspectives regarding the investments to meet national security space launch requirements.

In addition to these hearings, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces received a classified briefing on June 10, 2015, on the foreign counterspace threats and the Department of Defense’s posture and plans to respond to such threats.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included several legislative provisions related to national security space. Public Law 114–92 included multiple provisions regarding space launch, organization of management of space within the Department of Defense, improved acquisition of space capabilities, and placed limits or provided policy direction to certain programs to ensure warfighter requirements are being met.

During the second session of the 114th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on March 15, 2016, on “Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for National Security Space.” Senior military and civilian leaders served as witnesses to testify on the fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Department of Defense in the context of national security space. The subcommittee also met in a closed session, following the open hearing, to receive further classified details regarding national security space investments and strategies.

On September 27, 2016, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on “National Security Space: 21st Century Challenges, 20th Century Organization.” A former commander of U.S. Strategic Command, a former Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, and a former Deputy Secretary of Defense testified on challenges within the U.S. space enterprise related to organization, management, and command authorities.

In addition to these hearings, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces received a classified briefing on June 14 on space security war games, plans, and investments. On December 7, 2016, the sub-

committee received a briefing on national security space acquisitions.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes several legislative provisions dealing with national security space. S. 2943 includes provisions covering space launch, satellite communications, the Global Positioning System, space battle management command and control, the Department's organization and management of space, and would place limits or provided policy direction to certain programs to ensure warfighter requirements are being met.

## EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

### INVESTMENT IN FUTURE CAPABILITIES SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Department of Defense faces difficult choices as it balances the competing needs of capabilities for current operations and those projected for future conflicts. In order to address the latter, investments need to be made in the Department's Science and Technology (S&T) programs, and aligned appropriately with continued development and procurement programs to position the Department to meet future challenges. S&T investments can also be leveraged to support broader acquisition improvements or defense industrial base sustainment activities by creatively utilizing competitive or operational prototyping, technical transition or integration, or requirements maturation.

Preparing for the challenges of the future, the Department must create a portfolio of technological options that can address the perceived threats identified in the defense planning process, as well as the emergence of unanticipated events or strategic competitors. Emphasis should be placed not only on support to acquisition roadmaps, but also on capabilities to institutionalize adaptability. Doing that will require better integration of intelligence into the S&T cycle, as well as better cognizance of global developments and industry-based independent research and development. It will also require a solid foundation to allow for adaptability, which means having world-class people and facilities in which to conduct certain types of research and development.

The committee continued to encourage the Department to plan and execute a balanced S&T program that ensures the U.S. military can retain superiority for future generations. The committee has also continued to examine how S&T investments are integrated into strategic and operational plans to ensure that the investments being made, including in people and infrastructure, are properly aligned.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted several hearings within this area, including: a hearing on March 26, 2015, "Department of Defense (DOD) Fiscal Year 2016 Science and Technology Programs: Laying the Groundwork to Maintain Technological Superiority"; a hearing on November 19, 2015, "Advancing the Science and Acceptance of Autonomy for Future Defense Systems"; a briefing on December 16, 2015, "Defense Science Board Report on 21st Century Military Operations in a Complex Electromagnetic Environment"; a hearing on February 24, 2016, "Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2017

Science and Technology Programs to Discuss Defense Innovation to Create the Future Military Force”; a hearing on September 28, 2016, “Department of Defense Laboratories and Their Innovation Through Science and Engineering in Support of Military Operations”; a classified briefing on June 14, 2016, “The Role of Electromagnetic Spectrum in Future Military Operations”; and a briefing on December 8, 2016, “Defense Science Board Summer Study on Autonomy.”

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: an assessment of the directed energy industrial base; a review of the combatant commander requirements for directed energy weapons; a review by the Comptroller General of the United States of the measures and actions being taken to mitigate the loss of access to current sources of trusted microelectronics; a review by the Comptroller General of technology transition activities within the Department of Defense; and a review of the transition of technologies from the Strategic Capabilities Office.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included a provision that would require a plan for advanced technology war games; a provision that would extend the use of educational partnership agreements to support technology transition; a provision that would require the services and agencies to develop engagement strategies with historically black colleges and universities; a provision that would establish Centers for Science, Technology and Engineering Partnership; a provision that would authorize a technology offset fund; a provision that would extend the authorization for the Global Research Watch Program; a provision that would establish science and technology activities to support business system information technology acquisition programs; a provision that would expand eligibility for financial assistance under the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation program; a provision that would establish a pilot program for streamlining awards for innovative technology programs; a provision that would codify other transactions authority; a provision that would establish a cooperative research and development program with Israel to develop anti-tunneling defense capabilities; a provision that would modify the direct hiring authority for certain defense laboratories; a provision that would establish a pilot program for shaping the workforce at defense laboratories; and a provision that would extend authorization for the Rapid Innovation Program.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: a briefing on improving data collection efforts in order to provide complete and analyzable records for grant awards; a briefing on recent advances in desalination technologies; a briefing on low energy nuclear reactions; and a briefing on the potential military applications of nanomaterials for combat systems.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes a provision that would create a Laboratory Quality Enhancement Program; a provision that would modify the section

219 authority available to the defense laboratories; a provision that would limit the funds available to the Defense Innovation Unit Experimental until certain information is provided; a provision that would establish a pilot program to allow management flexibility at the defense laboratories, test and evaluation centers, and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency; a provision that would codify the section 1101 personnel authority in title 10; a provision that would make permanent the rapid innovation program; a provision that would allow the National Defense University and Defense Acquisition University the ability to enter into cooperative research and development agreements; a provision that would create a manufacturing engineering education grant program; a provision that would increase the micro-purchase threshold for basic research efforts; a provision that would create a pilot program to enhance cooperation between the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the military service academies; a provision that would extend and modify the Defense Acquisition Challenge Program; a provision that would extend the Small Business Innovative Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs until 2022; a provision that would make permanent and modify hiring authorities for defense laboratory personnel; and a provision that would create a pilot program to offer flexible pay authority for certain technical positions in the defense laboratories.

#### CYBER OPERATIONS CAPABILITIES

Cyber operations have taken on an increasingly important role in military operations, as well as overall in national security. Accordingly, the committee continued to closely scrutinize the Department of Defense's cyber operations, organization, manning, and funding to ensure that the military has the freedom of maneuver to conduct the range of missions in the Nation's defense, and when called upon, to support other interagency and international partners. An important oversight role for Congress regarding the conduct of defensive and offensive cyber operations has been to ensure that the proper legal and policy frameworks are in place and followed. The committee has also continued to scrutinize military cyber operations to ensure that they are properly integrated into the combatant commander's operational plans, and to ensure that adequate capabilities exist or are in development to employ these cyberspace operational tools with rigor and discretion to support a full range of options for the Nation's decision makers. In the course of monitoring the cybersecurity posture of the military, the committee has continued to examine the effects of globalization on the assured integrity of microelectronics and software.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted several hearings and briefings within this area, including: a briefing on February 12, 2015, "Cyber Operations Quarterly Update"; a hearing on March 4, 2015, "Cyber Operations: Improving the Military Cyber Security Posture in an Uncertain Threat Environment"; a hearing on September 29, 2015, "Outside Perspectives on the Department of Defense Cyber Strategy"; a hearing on September 30, 2015, "Implementing the Department of Defense Cyber Strategy"; a briefing on September 30, 2015, "Cyber Operations Quarterly Update"; a hearing on November 17, 2015,

“Update on Office of Personnel Management Network Intrusion and Disclosure of Sensitive Personnel Data”; a briefing on January 12, 2016, “Cyber Operations Quarterly Update”; a hearing on March 16, 2016, “Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for U.S. Cyber Command for Preparing for Operations in the Cyber Domain.”

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: a review by the Comptroller General of the United States assessing the Department of Defense’s plans and actions for providing support to civil authorities in the event of a domestic cyber event; a briefing by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics detailing the process for identifying and assessing cyber vulnerabilities on legacy weapons and mission systems; a briefing by the Secretary of Defense assessing and validating the multi-source cyber intelligence collection and analysis needs of the Department of Defense; and an assessment of potential cyber vulnerabilities to smart buildings and access control systems.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included a provision that would require the codification of reporting on cyber incidents or penetrations of networks and information systems of certain contractors in title 10, United States Code, as well as the addition of liability protections related to such reporting; a provision that would reestablish the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attacks; a provision that would streamline the reporting requirements for the Joint Federated Assurance Center; a provision that would establish acquisition authority for the Commander of United States Cyber Command; a provision that would establish new cyber workforce hiring authorities for United States Cyber Command; a provision that would provide authorization for preparing forces for military cyber operations; a provision that would designate Department of Defense entities to be responsible for acquisition of critical cyber capabilities; a provision that would establish a fund for conducting cyber vulnerability assessments of major weapon systems; and a provision that would require an assessment of capabilities of United States Cyber Command to defend the United States from cyber attacks by foreign powers.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: a briefing on the impact of the Wassenaar Agreement to Department of Defense applications; an assessment and report by the Comptroller General on the Department of Defense’s planning and management for the security impact and challenges that the Internet of Things will present to the Department; a briefing assessing the capabilities and needs for electromagnetic pulse hardening Department of Defense microgrids; a report by the Comptroller General assessing the Department’s management and measurement of progress in protecting its own networks, systems, and information; a briefing on how to implement a pilot to cyber harden existing programs through sustainment activities in fiscal year 2018; a briefing on the training equivalency process for the Department; a

briefing assessing the policies and processes for coordinating information assurance policies on test and evaluation facilities when conducting joint or multiservice test and evaluation activities; and a briefing reviewing and assessing the dual-hat relationship for Cyber Command.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes a provision that would elevate Cyber Command to a full unified command; a provision that would expand existing special procurement authority to include uses for defense against or recovery from a cyber attack; a provision that would require combatant commands to enter into agreements relating to the use of cyber opposition forces; a provision requiring a strategy for incorporating Army National Guard forces into cyber protection teams; a provision that would provide additional training for human resources professionals at Cyber Command; a provision that would establish an advisory committee on industrial security and industrial base policy; a provision that would limit the termination of the dual-hat relationship between the National Security Agency and Cyber Command; a provision that would allow the Department to provide cyber support to personnel vulnerable to cyber attacks; a provision that would expedite evaluation of the cyber vulnerabilities to the F-35 aircraft and support systems; a provision that would require evaluation of the cyber vulnerabilities of defense critical infrastructure; a provision that would require a report on cyber deterrence capabilities; and a provision requiring a plan for information security continuous monitoring capabilities and comply-to-connect policy.

#### INFORMATION OPERATIONS

Engagement with foreign audiences and nuanced understanding of the information environment is pivotal in navigating the 21st century security environment. Whether one is trying to influence nation-state actors or potential allies, counter violent extremist groups, or identify and counter efforts at deception or misinformation, strategic communication and information operations are key elements to success on the battlefield. These elements are an important tool to prevent or deter conflict before escalation. The ability to carry out such operations against nation-states, as well as individuals and small terrorist groups, requires a flexible and adaptable strategy, as well as comprehensive understanding of specific groups, their motivating ideologies, and the tools to translate that understanding into action.

With the resurgence of violent extremist groups like Al Shabaab, Boko Haram, and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, the need for the Department of Defense to plan and execute effective information operations is continuing to grow. Recent examples illustrate how these groups are utilizing social media to support the radicalization process, as well as planning, financing, and command and control for terrorist acts. The committee has paid particular attention to the Department of Defense's information operations and strategic communication strategies, and how these tools will be further developed and adapted to support warfighter needs in a changing security environment, while maintaining appropriate controls for privacy and civil liberties. These activities enable mili-

tary operations and military support to diplomacy, and the committee has continued to conduct oversight of these critical capabilities, with focus on how these tools are integrated into theater security cooperation plans and leveraged with related tools for cyber and security force assistance.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted several hearings and briefings within this area, including: a briefing on September 18, 2015, “Improving Department of Defense Operations in the Information Environment: A Roundtable Discussion on Technology and Concepts”; a hearing on October 22, 2015, “Countering Adversarial Propaganda: Charting an Effective Course in the Contested Information Environment”; and a briefing on December 2, 2015, “Information Operations Update.”

H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as passed by the House, included a provision that allows the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program to assess information-related and strategic communications capabilities to support the tactical, operational, and strategic requirements of the various combatant commanders, including urgent and emergent operational needs, and the operational and theater security cooperation plans of the geographic and functional combatant commanders.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) included a provision that requires the Secretary of Defense to carry out a series of technology demonstrations, subject to the availability of funds for such purpose or to a prior approval reprogramming, related to information operations and information engagement to support the geographic and functional combatant commanders, with associated notification requirements.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–537) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, the committee included directive reporting requirements that would require: a briefing on the Department’s long-term strategy to counter adversarial messaging and recruiting utilizing digital technologies, including social media; a briefing assessing the current policy directives on how defense entities use such social media tools; and a strategy for regionally building partnership capacity that addresses the monitoring, data collection of narratives, and development of networks for countering narratives to support the missions of the combatant commands.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes a provision that would codify and expand the functions of the Global Engagement Center.

#### COMPROMISES OF NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION AND INSIDER THREATS

The committee received regular updates from the Department of Defense on unauthorized disclosures of classified information throughout the 114th Congress. The committee remains concerned about several recent high-profile cases of unauthorized classified information disclosures and other mishandling of classified information by cleared personnel, and the impact of these incidents on

national security. In response to these continuing issues, the fiscal year 2016 and 2017 National Defense Authorization Acts directed several enhancements to security policies and practices, improved audit capabilities, and information-sharing initiatives.

#### USE OF FORCE IN COUNTERTERRORISM OPERATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES AND AREAS OF ACTIVE HOSTILITIES

The committee continued to conduct extensive oversight, often in classified form, over the use of force in counterterrorism operations and sensitive activities outside of the United States and areas of active hostilities. While the use of force in this area has been overseen in all aspects, the committee paid particular attention to special operations forces and activities, and the interagency coordination that occurs with the U.S. Intelligence Community. In conducting this oversight, the committee also reviewed and considered Presidential policy guidance documents and similar executive branch directives. The committee ensured that counterterrorism operations and sensitive activities conducted outside of the United States and areas of active hostilities are in line with broader national security objectives, strategies, and resources. The committee additionally conducted issue-driven oversight in this area via secure communications and briefings with senior Department of Defense and Intelligence Community officials. Throughout the 114th Congress, committee Members and staff traveled extensively overseas to review programs and activities outside of the United States and within areas of active hostilities.

#### COUNTERING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Countering weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is a key mission for the Department of Defense. The proliferation and potential use of nuclear, chemical, and biological agents pose a unique and enduring threat to U.S. national security. To respond to this threat, the Department is engaged in activities to understand the environment, threats, and vulnerabilities; control, defeat, disable, and dispose of WMD threats; and safeguard the force and manage WMD consequences. The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued reviewing the Department's countering WMD plans and programs to ensure the WMD threat is appropriately addressed and is properly resourced despite decreasing budgets and competing priorities.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held several hearings and briefings on countering WMD, including: a hearing on March 25, 2015, "Countering WMD Strategy and FY16 Budget Request: Defense Threat Reduction Agency and Chemical and Biological Defense"; a briefing on June 10, 2015, "An Update on the Inadvertent Transfer of Live Anthrax Samples by the Department of Defense"; a briefing on November 4, 2015, "An Update and Threat Forecast on the Development and Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) by State and Non-State Actors"; a hearing on February 3, 2016, "Outside Views on Biodefense for the Department of Defense"; a hearing on February 10, 2016, "Department of Defense Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Policy and Programs for Fiscal Year 2017."

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee included several directives related to countering weapons of mass destruction, including: a briefing on the Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction situational awareness prototype Constellation; a briefing on the Department of Defense’s biological research and developmental work, to include partnerships with non-profit research facilities regarding potential renewed viral threats of especially dangerous pathogens; a Comptroller General of the United States review of the preparedness of the Homeland Response Forces to accomplish their mission; and a Comptroller General review of the Department of Defense’s planning to support civil authorities in the event of a pandemic disease outbreak.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), included several legislative provisions related to countering weapons of mass destruction. These include: a limitation of funds for the advanced development and manufacturing facility under the medical countermeasure program; an extension of the authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction from section 1204 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66); and a modification to section 1412(b)(3) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–145) that extends the stockpile elimination deadline of lethal chemical agents and munitions; and recommendations on the inadvertent transfer of anthrax from the Department of Defense.

S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, includes several legislative provisions related to countering weapons of mass destruction. These include: requirements for improved biosafety handling and incident reporting of select agents and toxins to hold the Department of Defense accountable for some of the findings from the inadvertent transfer of anthrax; and direction for the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Agriculture to jointly develop and submit a national bio-defense strategy and implementation plan.

## ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE FULL COMMITTEE

### FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND BRIEFINGS

During the 114th Congress, the committee held a series of budget and posture hearings and briefings in preparation for the fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017 budgets. These hearings and briefings, combined with the committee’s responsibility for assembling the annual defense authorization bill, are a central element in the discharge of the committee’s oversight responsibilities. In upholding its responsibilities to mitigate waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Federal Government programs, and pursuant to House rule XI, clauses 2(n), (o), and (p), the committee met several times to conduct oversight of Department of Defense activities, as noted elsewhere in this report.

To inform its consideration of the fiscal year 2016 budget request, the committee convened a hearing on February 3, 2015, with defense intelligence leaders to receive testimony on worldwide threats. On March 17, 2015, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from the Secretaries of the military departments and the military service chiefs, and on March 18, 2015, the committee received testimony from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Department of Defense fiscal year 2016 budget request. The committee also sought the perspective of the commanders of the unified combatant commands and the commander of Operation Resolute Support through several briefings and hearings in 2015. Additionally, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from Members of Congress on their national defense priorities for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, which took place on April 14, 2015.

To inform its consideration of the fiscal year 2017 budget request, the committee convened a hearing on March 2, 2016, with defense intelligence leaders to receive testimony on worldwide threats. On March 16, 2016, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from the Secretaries of the military departments and the military service chiefs, and on March 22, 2016, the committee received testimony from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Department of Defense fiscal year 2017 budget request. The committee also sought the perspective of the commanders of the unified combatant commands and the commanders of Operation Resolute Support and Operation Inherent Resolve through briefings and hearings in 2016. Additionally, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from Members of Congress on their national defense priorities for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, which took place on March 1, 2016.

In keeping with the committee's emphasis on defense reform, the committee convened a series of hearings and briefings throughout the 114th Congress to examine: challenges to the technological superiority of the United States, acquisition agility, foreign material sales processes, security cooperation, improvements to the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433), and compensation and healthcare for service members and their dependents.

Additionally, as events transpired in the Middle East, specifically relating to the rise of the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and subsequent U.S. military operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic, the committee met several times over the course of the 114th Congress to conduct oversight hearings and briefings on the threat and the Administration's policy and strategy to defeat ISIL. These included classified briefings on the security situation and military operations in Iraq and Syria with senior defense and Intelligence Community officials; hearings on the strategy and campaign against ISIL with defense officials, military commanders, and outside experts; and a hearing with outside experts on the President's proposed authorization for the use of military force against ISIL. Additionally, the committee held a series of hearings and briefings on the United States' ongoing mili-

tary operations in Afghanistan, ongoing global counterterrorism operations, as well as a series of events on Islamic extremism trends and implications for U.S. policy.

The committee also held frequent classified briefings to receive intelligence and operational updates on threat developments across the globe. These briefings informed the committee's oversight hearings and briefings on the Department's strategic reassurance and deterrence activities in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, and on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with the Islamic Republic of Iran. They also informed the committee's legislative initiatives in readiness, capabilities, and infrastructure to ensure that the U.S. Armed Forces remain capable of addressing current and emerging conventional and unconventional threats.

The committee also sought to emphasize and complement the oversight work of the subcommittees and, throughout the 114th Congress, conducted oversight series focused on the readiness challenges of the military services, nuclear deterrence and the state of the U.S. nuclear enterprise, and the Department's cyber strategy and cyber operations. The committee also held classified events with the Intelligence Community to examine how the intelligence enterprise supports defense acquisition, conducts defense human intelligence, and is addressing shortfalls in intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance capabilities.

Lastly, the committee conducted a hearing on the audit readiness of the Department of Defense, which remains an area of high risk as identified by the Comptroller General of the United States, and convened four briefings with Department of Defense, Department of State, and Intelligence Community officials on transfers of detainees from the detention facility at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

#### BUDGET OVERSIGHT

On February 27, 2015, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services forwarded his views and estimates regarding the budget request for National Defense Budget Function (050) for fiscal year 2016 to the Committee on the Budget. The President's fiscal year 2016 budget requested \$561.0 billion in discretionary budget authority for national defense. Of this total, \$534.3 billion was for the Department of Defense, \$19.1 billion for the Department of Energy's defense activities, and \$7.6 billion for other defense-related activities. The President's budget request also included \$9.0 billion in mandatory budget authority. The budget submission did not comply with the limitations mandated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) for funding levels in fiscal year 2016 and across all budgeted fiscal years. In addition to the base budget request, as required by section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the President's budget request for fiscal year 2016 included a separate request of \$50.9 billion, presented as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO), for war-related expenditures in support of ongoing military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, military operations against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), forward presence in other critical areas, and the resetting of equipment.

The House anticipated in 2014 that requirements for fiscal year 2016 would exceed those for fiscal year 2015. In fact, the House-passed budget resolution increased national defense spending to \$566.0 billion in fiscal year 2016, and returned funding to pre-sequestration levels in fiscal year 2017 and out. The House-passed fiscal year 2015 budget resolution provided \$5.0 billion more for fiscal year 2016 than the President's fiscal year 2016 budget request.

The committee discussed that, over the last 3 years, the level of funding requested for defense has seen significant decline. In fiscal year 2013, defense spending would decrease by 17 percent under sequestration when compared with the level projected for fiscal year 2013 in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) that was submitted in February 2010. Even prior to sequestration, defense spending had already been reduced by 9 percent from the plan submitted just 2 years earlier.

The committee noted that over the prior 5 years, the level of funding requested and appropriated for national defense had declined. Under sequestration, national defense spending would decrease over 21 percent in fiscal year 2016, when compared with the level projected for fiscal year 2016 in the outyear budget documentation included in the first budget request prepared by the Administration, submitted in February 2010. The committee continued to be concerned that resources were insufficient to fulfill the current defense strategy. The committee noted that although the civilian and military leadership of the Department of Defense attempted to defend each successively lower budget request, their previous testimony directly contradicted the assertion that the fiscal year 2016 budget request would allow the military to fulfill the defense strategy at low to moderate risk.

The committee agreed in 2015, with the views of General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that the President's fiscal year 2016 budget request was at "the lower ragged edge" of the Department's ability to execute the National Security Strategy, with moderate risk. At these funding levels, the degradation of hardware requirements was stemmed, but the replenishment of years of readiness shortfalls could not be immediately recovered. As submitted, the Department admitted that it would not be able to fully fight and meet the demands of the National Military Strategy until 2023. The threat of sequestration-level funding would continue to impact national defense. The committee urged the continued support of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to ensure adequate funding for national defense in fiscal year 2016 and beyond, preferably at pre-sequestration levels, but at a minimum level of what was previously voted upon in the fiscal year 2015 House-passed budget resolution.

The committee's ranking member did not join the chairman in his views and estimates. Instead, the ranking member was joined by 24 other Members of the committee in submitting alternative views and estimates that the fiscal year 2016 budget request offered the Congress a solid basis for cost-effective planning and decision-making and supported current and future military requirements. The alternative views discussed that the Congress must eliminate sequestration to: dispel uncertainty, empower economic recovery, and grant the legislative and executive branches of gov-

ernment the flexibility needed to identify and implement savings within the budget in a responsible and deliberate manner. The Congress must then pass a comprehensive, long-term, deficit-reduction plan to solve the country's fiscal challenges and to promote national security, economic stability, and the continued growth and prosperity of the United States. The ranking member noted that deficit-reduction goals cannot be effectuated through cuts alone, and that increased revenues and changes in mandatory spending must be considered. The Congress must, therefore, establish a manageable, long-term, discretionary spending plan that advances national interests on a broad front.

On February 5, 2016, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services forwarded his views on the resources required for national defense, as the budget request had not yet been received by Congress, and a review of committee's legislative activities for the year. The committee noted that an adequate national defense required significant additional funding. The committee also recognized that the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–74) set a level of base funding for fiscal year 2017, as well as a minimum estimate of OCO funding to meet additional base requirements and to fund current operations. These views further stated that, at an absolute minimum, the agreement that Congress and the President reached must be enforced and fully funded at the agreed levels.

The committee discussed that Public Law 114–74 provided for a base funding level in fiscal year 2017 of \$551.0 billion for defense. In addition, the agreement provided for a minimum of \$59.0 billion in adjustments to the defense cap for OCO, for a total of \$610.0 billion for national defense. Since it was understood during the budget negotiations that \$551.0 billion for base funding was insufficient to meet the military's base requirements, the agreement further designated funding within OCO to cover base budget requirements. The level of funding for base requirements was specific for fiscal year 2016, but undefined in fiscal year 2017. However, the fiscal year 2016 budget request and fiscal year 2016 House budget resolution both identified the level of funding necessary to support fiscal year 2017 base requirements as approximately \$574.0 billion. Therefore, the consensus was that the fiscal year 2017 base requirements would be supported through a combination of base funding and OCO funding. To cover that minimum level of funding, \$23.0 billion of the OCO adjustment would support base requirements, and an additional amount of OCO would fund current operations, the precise amount of which would depend on the world security situation and U.S. deployments. Any additional unidentified emergent requirements, which are appropriately funded through OCO, should have been added to the President's budget submission. As indicated in the section by section analysis of the legislation, the section referring to OCO funds "establishes minimum adjustments to the defense . . . caps for overseas contingency operations."

The committee noted that while the budget request had not yet been received, there was concern about how the Administration was interpreting the budget agreement. It was concerned that the Office of Management and Budget would determine that a combined total of \$610.0 billion for base and OCO in Public Law 114–

74 was an upper limit for defense spending. Therefore, the total request for funds would equal an estimated \$610.0 billion for all national defense requirements, and that new additional OCO requirements would cannibalize funding for base requirements. As the Comptroller of the Department of Defense had publicly stated, that in light of emerging OCO requirements, there would be “a \$15 billion or so cut” in fiscal year 2017 that would result in “slow-downs in some modernization programs.” This was a direct contradiction to the agreement between the House of Representatives and Senate that the OCO levels for defense in fiscal year 2017 were the floor, not the ceiling.

The committee recommended House Republicans insist upon at least an additional \$15.0 to \$23.0 billion, depending on how much of the designated funding in OCO for base requirements was consumed to address valid emergent threats, to cover the national defense base requirements in the upcoming budget resolution and to enforce the executive branch’s agreement in the BBA. The committee also recommended a further discussion of additional resources for emergent issues based on the President’s underestimation of security risks to the United States and mismanagement of core national security priorities, including the military’s posture in Afghanistan; its escalating efforts to counter ISIL; and its efforts to deter Russian Federation aggression.

## ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

In coordination with the committee, the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted additional oversight of specific issues related to the global war on terrorism, to include; special operations capabilities, counter-terrorism, and counter-proliferation programs and activities; homeland defense and consequence management programs; intelligence policy, national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements of the intelligence community. Further details on these subcommittee activities are provided elsewhere in this report.

In order to conduct oversight, subcommittee members and staff made numerous trips to countries impacted by terrorism and emerging threats, to include areas where U.S. forces are engaged in combat operations, to further understand the resources leveraged against terrorism and other emerging threats, the authorities applied in these efforts, and the Department of Defense’s interaction with its interagency and international partners. These congressional and staff delegations were preceded by operational and intelligence oversight briefings to Members and staff by senior officials from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Intelligence Community, and represented an important part of oversight conducted by the subcommittee. Countries visited include: United Arab Emirates, the Republic of Turkey, the State of Kuwait, the Islamic Republic of Iraq, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Federal Republic of Somalia, the Republic of Kenya, the Republic of Djibouti, the Republic of Niger, the Kingdom of Mo-

rocco, the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the Republic of Korea.

The subcommittee considered and reported several legislative provisions in H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as passed by the House, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92), H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as passed by the House, and S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. The legislative provisions covered a range of issues within the subcommittee's jurisdiction including: counter-terrorism and counter-proliferation programs and activities; U.S. Special Operations Forces; science and technology policy and programs, including the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency; information technology and programs; homeland defense and consequence management programs; and defense intelligence policy. These specifically included: an executive agent for the oversight and management of alternative compensatory control measures; congressional notification and briefing requirements on ordered evacuations of U.S. embassies and consulates involving the use of United States Armed Forces; and provisions previously addressed elsewhere in this report.

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities included several legislative provisions related to the global war on terrorism in H.R. 1735, as passed by the House, and Public Law 114-92 including: a section that would make permanent the authority for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or government personnel of allied forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. Armed Forces conducted outside the United States against international terrorism or providing such information or assistance that is beneficial to force protection associated with such an operation; a section that would increase from \$75 million to \$85 million the authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism pursuant to section 1208 of the Ronald Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375); and a section that would extend by 1 year, the authority for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities for conventional and special operations forces pursuant to subsection (h) of section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417), as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81); and an extension of authority to conduct family support programs for immediate family members of members of the Armed Forces assigned to U.S. Special Operations Forces.

Additionally, the subcommittee assisted the committee with several provisions in Public Law 114-92, and S. 2943 related to weapons of mass destruction, building partnership capacity, security force assistance, counterinsurgency, defense intelligence, and the regional conflicts in Afghanistan, Syrian Arab Republic, State of Libya, and East Africa, which are addressed elsewhere in this report.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel continued oversight of military personnel issues including; military service end-strength, compensation and benefits, commissaries, morale welfare and recreation programs, military medical care, the Uniformed Code of Military Justice and other issues that impacted military personnel in fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017. The subcommittee conducted numerous oversight hearings and briefings with the Department of Defense and outside organizations and individuals as detailed below as well as multiple oversight trips to bases and countries when military personnel are stationed.

On February 4, 2015, the subcommittee received the initial report of the Judicial Proceedings Panel.

On February 11, 2015 the subcommittee met to receive testimony on the final recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

On March 17, 2015, the subcommittee met for a closed Member Roundtable on the retirement and quality of life recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to focus on military retirement reform.

On March 19, 2015, the subcommittee met for a roundtable on the health care recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

On March 25, 2015, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on the stakeholder's views on the recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

On June 11, 2015, the subcommittee held a hearing on the Department of Defense views on the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission's recommendations for military health care reform.

On June 24, 2015, the subcommittee met to receive a closed briefing on the implementation of the recommendations of the reviews following the sexual assault incidents at Lackland Air Force Base and to receive an update on the Air Force Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program.

On September 17, 2015, the subcommittee met to receive the recommendations and the results of the military resale study conducted by the Boston Consulting Group.

On October 23, 2015, the subcommittee met for a roundtable briefing on the Department of Defense views on military resale reform.

On November 4, 2015, the subcommittee met for a closed briefing on Health Insurance/ TRICARE 101.

On November 18, 2015, the subcommittee met for a briefing from former military Surgeons General on military health care reform.

On December 9, 2015, the subcommittee met to hear testimony from the stakeholders on the Survivor Benefit Plan, Dependency and Indemnity Compensation financial offset.

On January 13, 2016 the subcommittee met to hear testimony from the Department of Defense on the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission's recommendations on military resale reform.

On February 3, 2016, the subcommittee met to hear testimony on the mission and benefits of military treatment facilities.

On February 24, 2016, the subcommittee met to hear testimony on the Defense Health Agency's budgeting and structure.

On March 3, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on military personnel posture for fiscal year 2017.

On March 17, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on stakeholder views on the Department of Defense's FY17 modernization of the TRICARE health plan proposal.

On June 10, 2016, the subcommittee received a briefing from the Director of the Federal Voting Assistance Program for the Department of Defense (DOD) on the initiatives undertaken to ensure effectiveness and compliance of the Service's Voting Assistance Programs. The briefing included the current status of voting assistance programs and their efficacy; initiatives to improve tracking of military and overseas absentee ballots; and actions taken in response to the findings of the March 2016 DOD Inspector General Report.

On June 15, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing regarding an update on the Department of Defense and military services' suicide prevention program.

On June 22, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing from DOD witnesses regarding a report on the rights of conscience protections for service members and their chaplains.

On September 8, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on H.R. 4298: Vietnam Helicopter Crew Memorial Act and H.R. 5458: Veterans TRICARE Choice Act.

On September 13, 2016, the subcommittee continued its oversight efforts and met to receive a roundtable briefing on an update on commissary reform from the Department of Defense.

On December 7, 2016, the subcommittee met to hear testimony from the National Guard and Department of Defense on the California National Guard bonus repayment issue.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

The Subcommittee on Readiness continued oversight of military readiness, training, logistics, and maintenance issues; military construction, installations, and family housing issues; energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense; and civilian personnel and service contracting issues.

On February 3, 2015, the committee received a briefing on "Worldwide Readiness Update." The briefing provided an update to members on the current state of readiness across the military departments and the functional and geographic combatant commands (COCOM) with a specific focus on current shortfalls and gaps. The briefing also highlighted some of the most resource-intensive operations plans and the military departments' capacity to provide sufficient ready forces to meet COCOM requirements.

On March 3, 2015, the committee received testimony on "Alignment of Infrastructure Investment and Risk and Defense Strategic Requirements." This hearing explored the fiscal year 2016 military construction, family housing, base realignment and closure, and facilities operations and maintenance budget request; specifically, to what extent the risks in infrastructure investment have been calculated, what has been the impact of reduced investment, is the

new base realignment and closure request appropriate in the near term, and does the infrastructure investment strategy align with the National Security Strategy and Defense Strategic Guidance?

On March 26, 2015, the committee received testimony on “The Department of Defense’s Readiness Posture.” The four military vice chiefs of staff provided testimony on each of the military services’ fiscal year 2016 budget requests, priorities, and key readiness-related issues. The hearing allowed Members to learn more about specific investments and projected spending on operations, training, exercises, flight hour programs, weapons system, sustainment, reset and retrograde, and depot maintenance. It also provided Members an opportunity to learn about operation and maintenance funding investments required to sustain platforms outside the military services’ planned budgets (such as the A-10), and what readiness investments are most at risk under sequestration or Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) spending levels.

On April 15, 2015, the committee met to receive a roundtable briefing on U.S. Transportation Command.

On June 12, 2015, the committee met to receive a classified briefing on “Army Force Generation: requirements and challenges.”

On July 30, 2015, the committee met to receive a classified hearing on “Status of European Command Training and Readiness Initiatives.”

On September 10, 2015, the committee met to receive testimony on the Navy’s “Optimized Fleet Response Plan.”

On September 18, 2015, the committee met to receive a classified briefing on the “State of Air Force Readiness.”

On October 1, 2015, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Public Shipyards’ Role in Meeting Operational Requirements.”

On October 23, 2015, the committee met with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces to receive a classified briefing on the “South China Sea—Current Operations and Future Requirements for Naval Forces.”

On November 3, 2015, the committee met with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces to receive testimony on “Aircraft Carrier—Presence and Surge Limitations and Expanding Power Projection Options.”

On December 3, 2015, the committee received testimony on “Effects of Reduced Infrastructure and Base Operating Support Investments on Readiness.”

On January 8, 2016, the subcommittee received testimony on “Effects of Reduced Infrastructure and Base Operating Support Investments on Navy Readiness.”

On January 13, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Effects of Reduced Infrastructure and Base Operating Support Investments on Air Force Readiness.”

On February 11, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on “Regionally Aligned Forces—AFRICOM.”

On February 12, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Department of the Air Force 2017 Operation and Maintenance Budget Request and Readiness Posture.”

On February 26, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Department of the Army 2017 Operation and Maintenance Budget Request and Readiness Posture.”

On March 3, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “The Marine Corps 2017 Operation and Maintenance Budget Request and Readiness Posture.”

On March 15, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “The U.S. Transportation Command Fiscal Year 2017 Readiness Posture.”

On March 17, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “The Department of the Navy 2017 Operations and Maintenance Budget Request and Readiness Posture.”

On April 15, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on the “Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress.”

On May 23, 2016, the subcommittee sent a congressional delegation to the USS *Eisenhower* (CVN 69) jointly with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces to receive a briefing on “The Fleet of the Future: Building the 21st Century Navy.”

On May 26, 2016, the subcommittee met jointly with the subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces to receive testimony on “Navy Force Structure Readiness: Perspectives from the Fleet.”

On June 10, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on “Update on DOD Civilian Personnel Initiatives.”

On July 6, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Aviation Readiness.”

On September 15, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on “Arctic Readiness.”

On December 1, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on “Army Reserve and Army National Guard Readiness.”

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER AND PROJECTION FORCES

The subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces conducted a series of hearings to review programs included in the budget requests for fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017.

In addition, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearings on the following topics: Air Force Projection Forces Aviation Programs and Capabilities for Fiscal Year 2016; a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on the Naval Cooperative Strategy; Role of Surface Forces in Presence, Deterrence, and Warfighting; Capacity of U.S. Navy to Project Power with Large Surface Combatants; a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Readiness on Aircraft Carrier—Presence and Surge Limitations and Expanding Power Projection Options; Acquisition Efficiency and the Future Navy Force; Game Changing Innovations and the Future Surface Warfare; Game Changing and Innovations and the Future of Surface Warfare; Carrier Air Wing and the Future of Naval Aviation; Air Force Projection Forces Aviation Programs and Capabilities for Fiscal Year 2017; Logistics and Sealift Force Requirements; Building the Navy of the Future: A Look at Navy Force Structure; a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Readiness on the Fleet of the Future: Building the 21st Century; a joint hearing with the subcommittee on Readiness on Navy Force Structure Readiness: Perspectives from the Fleet; a joint hearing with the Committee on Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific on South China Sea Maritime Disputes; Naval Domi-

nance in Undersea Warfare; Next Generation Air Space Control—Ensuring Air Force Compliance by January 1, 2020; and Seapower and Projection Forces in the South China Sea.

In addition to hearings, the subcommittee conducted numerous briefings on the following topics: Small Surface Combatant Task Force; Long Range Strike Bomber; Shipbuilding Overview and Industrial Base Implications; SSN/SSBN Security Technology Program; Navy Force Structure Assessment, Deployment Gaps, and Presence Trends; Mine Countermeasures Capabilities and Challenges; South China Sea—Current Operations and Future Requirements for Naval Forces; and Navy Surface Warfare—Distributed Lethality; Navy Surface Warfare and Distributed Lethality Concepts; Navy Threats and Capabilities; B-21 Cost; and Worldwide Submarine Operations.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held five hearings regarding the President's fiscal year 2016 budget request. On February 26, 2015, the subcommittee held a hearing on the "Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Strategic Forces." On March 19, 2015, the subcommittee held a hearing on the "Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Missile Defense." On March 24, 2016, the subcommittee held a hearing on the "Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense." On March 25, 2016, the subcommittee held a hearing on the "Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for National Security Space." On April 15, 2016, the subcommittee held a hearing on the "Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Nuclear Forces."

In addition to oversight of the President's fiscal year 2016 budget request, the subcommittee held several oversight hearings during the first session of the 114th Congress. On September 10, 2015, the subcommittee held a hearing on "The Obama Administration's Deal with Iran: Implications for Missile Defense and Nonproliferation." On December 1, 2015, the subcommittee held a hearing on "Russian Arms Control Cheating: Violation of the INF Treaty and the Administration's Responses One Year Later," to review and assess the Administration's responses to the Russian Federation's violation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. On December 8, 2015, the subcommittee held a hearing on "Prompt Global Strike: American and Foreign Developments."

The subcommittee also held numerous briefings during the first session of the 114th Congress. On October 1, 2015, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on the missile defeat enterprise and left-of-launch. On October 22, 2015, the subcommittee met with the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces to receive a classified briefing on ICBM field security and implementation of the Nuclear Enterprise Review recommendations. On November 17, 2015, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on overview and status of the nuclear command, control, and communications system.

The subcommittee held five hearings regarding the President's fiscal year 2017 budget request. On February 11, 2016, the subcommittee held a hearing on the "Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense Activities." On February 24, 2016, the subcommittee held a hearing on "U.S. Strategic Forces Posture."

On March 2, 2016, the subcommittee held a hearing on the “Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for Department of Defense Nuclear Forces.” On March 15, 2016, the subcommittee held a hearing on the “Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for National Security Space.” On April 14, 2016, the subcommittee held a hearing on the “Missile Defeat Posture and Strategy of the United States—the Fiscal Year 2017 President’s Budget Request.”

Furthermore, during the second the session of the 114th Congress, the subcommittee held several briefings. On January 7, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on WMD threats and space threats. On February 2, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on proliferation threats from 3-D printing. On March 22, 2016, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for Cooperative Threat Reduction plans and programs.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON TACTICAL AIR AND LAND FORCES

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces provided oversight of all Departments of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Office of the Secretary of Defense acquisition programs providing tactical aircraft and missiles; armor and ground vehicles; munitions; rotorcraft; individual equipment to include tactical networks and radios; counter improvised explosive device equipment; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms to include unmanned aerial systems, and associated support equipment, including National Guard and Reserve equipment programs. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also provided oversight on policy, such as threats and force structure requirements, as appropriate within the subcommittee’s jurisdiction. This includes current or future acquisition programs that relate to gaps in the capabilities required to execute current national military strategies, as well as the allocation of acquisition resources. This would also include military service specific acquisition policies as long as there is a nexus to the subcommittee’s jurisdiction. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces focused on maintaining Air Dominance and Air Superiority, as well as policies ensuring effective use of land forces as a strategic deterrent.

The subcommittee conducted four oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2016 budget request, including the following: March 19, 2015: “Army and Marine Corps Ground Force and Rotorcraft Modernization Programs and the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request”; March 26, 2015: “Fiscal Year 2016 Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force Combat Aviation Programs”; April 14, 2015: “The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Program for Fiscal Year 2016”; October 21, 2015: “Update of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Program for Fiscal Year 2016.”

The subcommittee conducted four oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2017 budget request, including the following: March 2, 2016: “Ground Force Modernization Budget”; March 16, 2016: “Fiscal Year 2017 Army and Air Force Rotorcraft Modernization Programs”; March 23, 2016: “Update on the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Program and the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request.”

In addition to oversight hearings, the subcommittee held various briefings and events to conduct oversight including classified briefings: February 12, 2015: “Close Air Support”; February 26, 2015: “Threats to Air Dominance and U.S. 5th Generation Capability”; June 18, 2015: “Threats to U.S. Rotorcraft”; September 9, 2015: “Issues and Challenges Facing NATO’s Allied Land Command”; September 29, 2015: “Update on the Global IED Threat”; October 27, 2015: “The Challenges Facing U.S. Ground Forces Rotorcraft”; December 10, 2015: “Future of Land Warfare”; February 4, 2016: “Hearing on the Issues and Concerns Regarding Naval Strike Fighters”; February 10, 2016: “Hearing on the Recommendations from the National Commission on the Future of the Army”; February 26, 2016: “Russian Air Defense Systems and Russian Ground Systems”; June 8, 2016: “The Marine Corps Ground Combat Tactical Vehicle Strategy and Addressing Readiness Challenges”; June 18, 2016: “Field Hearing on Air Dominance and the Critical Role of Fifth Generation Fighter Aircraft”; July 13, 2016: “Hearing on Air Dominance and the Critical Role of Fifth Generation Fighters.”

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on April 23, 2015, and on Wednesday April 29, 2015, that was ultimately included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). The legislation covered a range of issues, including authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test, and evaluation programs for the Department of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Reserve Components.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on Wednesday, April 20, 2016, and on Tuesday, April 26, 2016, that was ultimately included in S. 2943, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations conducts comprehensive, in-depth oversight investigations, holds hearings, briefings, and other activities, and makes recommendations to the committee for consideration and potential legislative action.

##### *Inquiry into the Department of Defense’s May 2014 Transfer to Qatar of Five Law-of-war Detainees*

As described elsewhere in this report, in December 2015, the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and the committee chairman issued a 104-page report on the inquiry into the Department of Defense’s May 2014 transfer to the State of Qatar of five law-of-war detainees in connection with the recovery of a captive U.S. Army sergeant. The report included dissenting views of the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, and the committee ranking member. The report addressed the rationale for the transfer from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (GTMO), the process by which the transfer decision was made, the national security implications of the transfer, and related topics.

This work was the continuation of activities directed to be undertaken in 2014 by the previous committee chairman. In the course of this investigation, subcommittee staff conducted transcribed

interviews of 16 witnesses, including the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, Commander, U.S. Southern Command, Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, the individual who was “performing the duties of” the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in the absence of a confirmed nominee at the time of the transfer, the Department’s Special Envoy for the Closure of the Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility, the Department’s Deputy Special Envoy, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Central Asia, the Director of the Joint Staff’s Pakistan-Afghanistan Coordination Cell, the Commander, Joint Task Force-GTMO, two individuals who believed they had knowledge relevant to the inquiry, and others. The subcommittee staff also reviewed over 4,000 pages of classified and unclassified documents produced by the Department of Defense, hours of video, and conducted a staff oversight trip to Qatar, and facilitated two congressional delegations to GTMO.

#### *Oversight of the Nuclear Enterprise*

On June 25, 2015, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations convened a hearing entitled, “Update on Findings and Recommendations of the 2014 Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise Review.” Witnesses were: Dr. Yisroel Brumer, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Vice Admiral Terry Benedict, Director of Strategic Systems Programs, U.S. Navy; Major General Jack Weinstein, Commander of the 20th Numbered Air Force, U.S. Air Force; and Major General Richard Clark, Commander of the 8th Numbered Air Force, U.S. Air Force.

#### *The Department of Defense’s Assured Access to Micro-electronics*

On October 28, 2015, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations convened a hearing to consider the Department of Defense’s acquisition and application of microelectronic components, and to assess the potential risks posed by unsecure or inauthentic parts. The hearing also discussed activities that the Department is undertaking to mitigate any challenges posed by the microelectronics supply and manufacturing process. Witnesses were: Ms. Kristen Baldwin, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Mr. André Gudger, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Acting) for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Mr. Brett Hamilton, Division Chief Engineer for Trusted Microelectronics, Naval Surface Warfare Center—Crane, Indiana, U.S. Navy; and Ms. Marie Mak, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management Team, Government Accountability Office.

#### *Oversight of the Guantanamo Detainee Transfer Process*

As described elsewhere in this report, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held hearings and briefings to receive information on the process by which the Administration transfers law-of-war detainees from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to other countries and the activities of detainees after their transfer.

### *Afghanistan Oversight*

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations convened two hearings in connection with its continued oversight efforts of U.S. efforts in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. On February 12, 2016, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations convened a hearing entitled, “Assessing the Development of Afghanistan National Security Forces.” This hearing focused on the evolving security situation in Afghanistan and the policy, strategy, and posture required to develop, support and sustain the Government of Afghanistan. The subcommittee was brought up to date on the Department of Defense’s efforts to train, advise, and assist Afghanistan’s security forces. Witnesses were: Mr. Kent Breedlove, Senior Defense Analyst—Afghanistan, Defense Intelligence Agency; Ms. Christine Abizaid, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Central Asia, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Colonel Stephen L. A. Michael, U.S. Army, Deputy Director for Pakistan Afghanistan and Transregional Threats Coordination Cell, Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Hon. John Sopko, Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; and Mr. Michael Child, Deputy Inspector General for Overseas Contingency Operations, Department of Defense.

Subsequently, the subcommittee convened a hearing entitled, “Evaluating DOD Investments: Case Studies in Afghanistan Initiatives and US Weapons Sustainment” on April 13, 2016. The subcommittee received testimony regarding the Department’s decision-making, oversight, and execution of the following projects and programs of the Task Force for Business Stability Operations, and of the Defense Logistics Agency: the Afghan Compressed Natural Gas Infrastructure project; the TFBSO Housing Accommodations and Security requirements; the Rare Blonde Italian Cashmere Goat Textile production project; and, the Defense Logistics Agency’s aviation parts quality assurance program. Witnesses included the Honorable John Sopko, Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; Ms. Jacqueline L. Wicecarver, Deputy Inspector General for Auditing (Acting), Department of Defense; and Mr. Charlie Lilli, Deputy Director of Aviation and Head of Aviation Contracting Activity, Department of Defense, Defense Logistics Agency.

### *Oversight of Foreign Military Sales*

In 2016, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations convened a series of briefings and hearings to evaluate the U.S. Foreign Military Sales program. On April 20, 2016, the subcommittee held a briefing with Mr. Paul Kerr, Analyst, Congressional Research Service; the Honorable William G. P. Monahan, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regional Security and Security Assistance, Department of State; and Vice Admiral Joseph W. Rixey, Director of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency.

On May 11, 2016, the subcommittee convened a hearing entitled “U.S. Perspectives on the Department of Defense’s Policies, Roles, and Responsibilities for Foreign Military Sales” in order to receive the defense industrial base’s input on how to improve the execution of Foreign Military Sales. Witnesses were: Mr. Tom Davis, Senior Fellow at the National Defense Industrial Association; and Mr.

Remy Nathan, Vice President for International Affairs from the Aerospace Industries Association.

On May 17, 2016, the subcommittee convened a hearing entitled, “Assessing the Department of Defense’s Execution of Responsibilities in the U.S. Foreign Military Sales Program.” The objective of this hearing was to further familiarize Members with the Foreign Military Sales process and how it is managed by the Department. Witnesses were: Vice Admiral Joseph Rixey, U.S. Navy, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense; Ms. Claire Grady, Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics; and Ms. Beth McCormick, Director, Defense Technology and Security Administration, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

*Oversight of the Department of Defense Human Intelligence Capabilities*

On July 12, 2016, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities convened a joint classified briefing entitled, “Department of Defense Human Intelligence Capabilities—The Defense Clandestine Service: Organizational History and Proposed Changes.” This briefing focused on the creation of the Defense Clandestine Service and provided an overview of the Defense Clandestine Service’s operations, as well as internal and external oversight.

*Oversight of the European Reassurance Initiative*

On July 13, 2016, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations convened a hearing entitled, “Oversight of the European Reassurance Initiative.” Members received testimony about how the Department of Defense has been implementing the European Reassurance Initiative since Fiscal Year 2015, and how the Department plans to execute the initiative through fiscal year 2017. During this hearing, the witnesses described the opportunities and challenges the Department faces in implementing the European Reassurance Initiative in the current security environment and budgetary constraints. Witnesses were: Major General David Allvin, U.S. Air Force, J-5, U.S. European Command; Ms. Rachel Ellehuus, Principal Director, Europe and NATO Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense; and Mr. Tom Tyra, G-3/5/7, U.S. Army.

*Implications of Force Management Levels in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Syria*

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations convened a briefing and hearing series to assess the issues related to Force Management Levels (also known as “troop caps”), including financial and readiness considerations, and considerations regarding sovereignty and host nation acceptance. This briefing and hearing series also considered how Force Management Levels fit within broader warfighting strategies. The briefing was held on November 15, 2016, and the hearing was held on December 1, 2016. Both were entitled, “Force Management Levels in Iraq and Afghanistan; Readiness and Strategic Considerations.” Witnesses at the hearing were: Mr. Cary B. Russell, Director, Military Operations and

Warfighter Support, Government Accountability Office; General Carter Ham, U.S. Army, Retired; and Lieutenant General James Dubik, U.S. Army, Retired.

*Oversight of the U.S. Navy's Littoral Combat Ship Program*

On December 8, 2016, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations convened a hearing entitled, "Oversight Review of the U.S. Navy's Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Program." The subcommittee received testimony on the Navy's current requirements for a small surface combatant capability and explored the current acquisition, sustainment, and personnel strategies. The subcommittee also received testimony regarding current LCS testing and evaluation, and received assessments of the Navy's acquisition, sustainment, and personnel strategies. Witnesses were: the Honorable Sean Stackley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, Department of the Navy; Vice Admiral Thomas Rowden, U.S. Navy Commander, Naval Surface Forces; Dr. J. Michael Gilmore, Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, Department of Defense; Ms. Michele Mackin, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office; and Mr. Ron O'Rourke, Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Office.



## PUBLICATIONS

### HOUSE REPORTS

Report Number	Date Filed	Bill Number	Title
114-102 .....	May 5, 2015 .....	H.R. 1735 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.
114-102 Part 2 .....	May 12, 2015 .....	H.R. 1735 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.
114-537 .....	May 4, 2016 .....	H.R. 4909 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.
114-537 Part 2 .....	May 12, 2016 .....	H.R. 4909 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

### COMMITTEE PRINTS

Committee Print No. 1—Rules of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives of the United States, 114th Congress 2015–2016, adopted January 14, 2015.

Committee Print No. 2—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. Legislative Text and Joint Explanatory Statement to accompany S. 1356 (Public Law 114–92). November 2015.

### PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS

H.A.S.C. 114-1—Full Committee hearing on Committee Organization. Jan. 14, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-2—Full Committee hearing on A Case for Reform: Improving DOD's Ability to Respond to the Pace of Technological Change. Jan. 28, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-3—Full Committee hearing on Worldwide Threats. Feb. 3, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-4—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Wounded Warrior Program Update. Feb. 3, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-5—Full Committee hearing on Final Recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. Feb. 4, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-6—Full Committee hearing on The Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request: A View from Outside Experts: Alternative Budgets and Strategic Choices. Feb. 11, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-7—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Final Recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. Feb. 11, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-8—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Update on Detainee Transfers from Guantanamo. Feb. 12, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-9—Full Committee hearing on What is the State of Islamic Extremism: Key Trends, Challenges, and Implications for U.S. Policy. Feb. 13, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-10—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—How is DOD Responding to Emerging Security Challenges in Europe? Feb. 25, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-11—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Department of the Navy Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces. Feb. 25, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-12—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Information Technology Investments and Programs: Supporting Current Operations and Planning for the Future Threat Environment. Feb. 25, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-13—Full Committee hearing on Outside Perspectives on the President's Proposed Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant. Feb. 26, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-14—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Strategic Forces. Feb. 26, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-15—Full Committee hearing on The President's Proposed Authorization for Use of Military Force Against ISIL and U.S. Policy, Strategy, and Posture in the Greater Middle East. Mar. 3, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-16—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Alignment of Infrastructure Investment and Risk and Defense Strategic Requirements. Mar. 3, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-17—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—U.S. Policy, Strategy, and Posture in Afghanistan: Post-2014 Transition, Risks, and Lessons Learned. Mar. 4, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-18—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Air Force Projection Forces Aviation Programs and Capabilities for Fiscal Year 2016. Mar. 4, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-19—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Cyber Operations: Improving the Military Cybersecurity Posture in an Uncertain Threat Environment. Mar. 4, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-20—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Military Departments. Mar. 17, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-21—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Assuring Assured Access to Space. Mar. 17, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-22—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The President's Proposed Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against ISIL and the Fiscal Year 2016

National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense. Mar. 18, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–23—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Naval Cooperative Strategy (joint with Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure). Mar. 18, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–24—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Special Operations Forces in an Uncertain Threat Environment: A Review of the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Command. Mar. 18, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–25—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs. Mar. 19, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–26—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2016 Ground Force Modernization and Rotorcraft Modernization Programs. Mar. 19, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–27—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense. Mar. 24, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–28—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Stakeholder’s Views on the Recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. Mar. 25, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–29—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Strategy and the Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and Chemical Biological Defense Program. Mar. 25, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–30—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for National Security Space. Mar. 25, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–31—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Department of Defense’s Readiness Posture. Mar. 26, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–32—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Combat Aviation Modernization Programs and the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request. Mar. 26, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–33—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2016 Science and Technology Pro-

grams: Laying the Groundwork to Maintain Technological Superiority. Mar. 26, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-34—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Member Day—National Defense Priorities from Members for the Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. Apr. 14, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-35—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Update on the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Program and the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request. Apr. 14, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-36—Full Committee hearing on The Risk of Losing Military Technology Superiority and Its Implications for U.S. Policy, Strategy, and Posture in the Asia-Pacific. Apr. 15, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-37—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on The Role of Surface Forces in Presence, Deterrence, and Warfighting. Apr. 15, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-38—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for Nuclear Forces. Apr. 15, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-39—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on The Department of Defense Views on the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission's Recommendations for Military Health Care Reform. June 11, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-40—Full Committee hearing on U.S. Policy and Strategy in the Middle East. June 17, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-41—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Capacity of U.S. Navy to Project Power with Large Surface Combatants. June 17, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-42—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on The Counterterrorism Strategy Against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant: Are We on the Right Path? June 24, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-43—Full Committee hearing on Nuclear Deterrence in the 21st Century. June 25, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-44—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Update on Findings and Recommendations of the 2014 Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise Review. June 25, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-45—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Assuring National Security Space: Investing in American Industry to End Reliance on Russian Rocket Engines. June 26, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-46—Full Committee hearing on Potential Implications in the Region of the Iran Deal. July 29, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-47—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on The Future of Air Force Long-Range Strike—Capabilities and Employment Concepts. Sept. 9, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-48—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Optimized Fleet Response Plan. Sept. 10, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-49—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on The Obama Administration's Deal with Iran: Implications for Missile Defense and Nonproliferation. Sept. 10, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-50—Full Committee hearing on Outside Perspectives on the Department of Defense Cyber Strategy. Sept. 29, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-51—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on USAF Bomber Force Structure—Current Requirements and Future Vision. Sept. 29, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-52—Full Committee hearing on Implementing the Department of Defense Cyber Strategy. Sept. 30, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-53—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Public Shipyards' Role in Meeting Operational Requirements. Oct. 1, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-54—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Plutonium Disposition and the MOX Project. Oct. 7, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-55—Full Committee hearing on U.S. Strategy in Afghanistan. Oct. 8, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-56—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Update on Military Suicide Prevention Programs. Oct. 8, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-57—Full Committee hearing on Examining Department of Defense Security Cooperation: When It Works and When It Doesn't. Oct. 21, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-58—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Update on the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Program. Oct. 21, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-59—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Countering Adversarial Propaganda: Charting An Effective Course in the Contested Information Environment. Oct. 22, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-60—Full Committee hearing on Shortening the Defense Acquisition Cycle. Oct. 27, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-61—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Game Changers—Undersea Warfare. Oct. 27, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-62—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Transition Assistance Program—A Unity of Effort. Oct. 28, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-63—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Assessing DOD's Assured Access to Microelectronics in Support of U.S. National Security Requirements. Oct. 28, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-64—Subcommittees on Seapower and Projection Forces and Readiness joint hearing on Aircraft Carrier—Presence and Surge Limitations and Expanding Power Projection Options. Nov. 3, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-65—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Future Options for the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent—Views from Project Atom. Nov. 3, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-66—Full Committee hearing on Outside Views on the Strategy for Iraq and Syria. Nov. 18, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-67—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Advancing the Science and Acceptance of Autonomy for Future Defense Systems. Nov. 19, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-68—Full Committee hearing on U.S. Strategy for Syria and Iraq and Its Implications for the Region. Dec. 1, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114-69—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Acquisition Efficiency and the Future Navy Force. Dec. 1, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–70—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Russian Arms Control Cheating: Violation of the INF Treaty and the Administration’s Responses One Year Later (joint with Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade of the Committee on Foreign Affairs). Dec. 1, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–71—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Effects of Reduced Infrastructure and Base Operating Support Investments on Army and Marine Corps Readiness. Dec. 3, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–72—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Stakeholder Views on Military Health Care. Dec. 3, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–73—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Prompt Global Strike: American and Foreign Developments. Dec. 8, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–74—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Concurrent Receipt of Survivor Benefit Plan and Dependency and Indemnity Compensation. Dec. 9, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–75—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Game Changing Innovations and the Future of Surface Warfare. Dec. 9, 2015.

H.A.S.C. 114–76—Full Committee hearing on Acquisition Reform: Experimentation and Agility. Jan. 7, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–77—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Effects of Reduced Infrastructure and Base Operating Support Investments on Navy Readiness. Jan. 8, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–78—Full Committee hearing on Outside Views on the U.S. Strategy for Iraq and Syria and the Evolution of Islamic Extremism. Jan. 12, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–79—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Academies Study on Peer Review and Design Competition in the NNSA National Security Laboratories. Jan. 12, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–80—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Effects of Reduced Infrastructure and Base Operating Support Investments on Air Force Readiness. Jan. 13, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–81—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Views on Commissary Reform. Jan. 13, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–82—Full Committee hearing on Afghanistan in 2016: The Evolving Security Situation and U.S. Policy, Strategy, and Posture. Feb. 2, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–83—Full Committee hearing on Acquisition Reform: Starting Programs Well. Feb. 3, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–84—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Treatment Facilities. Feb. 3, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–85—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Outside Views on Biodefense for the Department of Defense. Feb. 3, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–86—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Naval Strike Fighters: Issues and Concerns. Feb. 4, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–87—Full Committee hearing on Understanding and Deterring Russia: U.S. Policies and Strategies. Feb. 10, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–88—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Recommendations from the National Commission on the Future of the Army. Feb. 10, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–89—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Department of Defense Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Policy and Programs for Fiscal Year 2017. Feb. 10, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–90—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense Activities. Feb. 11, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–91—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Carrier Air Wing and the Future of Naval Aviation. Feb. 11, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–92—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Department of the Air Force 2017 Operations and Maintenance Budget Request and Readiness Posture. Feb. 12, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–93—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Assessing the Development of Afghanistan National Security Forces. Feb. 12, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–94—Full Committee hearing on The Challenge of Conventional and Hybrid Warfare in the Asia Pacific Region: The Changing Nature of the Security Environment and Its Effect on Military Planning. Feb. 24, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–95—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2017 Science and Technology Programs: Defense Innovation to Create the Future Military Force. Feb. 24, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–96—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—U.S. Strategic Forces Posture. Feb. 24, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–97—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Defense Health Agency: Budgeting and Structure. Feb. 24, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–98—Full Committee hearing on Full Spectrum Challenges in Europe and Their Effects on Deterrence and Defense. Feb. 25, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–99—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Department of the Navy 2017 Budget Request and Seapower and Projection Forces. Feb. 25, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–100—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Department of the Army 2017 Operations and Maintenance Budget Request and Readiness Posture. Feb. 26, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–101—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Ensuring Medical Readiness in the Future. Feb. 26, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–102—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Member Day—National Defense Priorities

from Members for the FY 2017 National Defense Authorization Act. Mar. 1, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–103—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Air Force Projection Forces Aviation Programs and Capabilities for Fiscal Year 2017. Mar. 1, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–104—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Special Operations Forces in an Evolving Threat Environment: A Review of the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Command. Mar. 1, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–105—Full Committee hearing on World Wide Threats. Mar. 2, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–106—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Ground Force Modernization Budget Request. Mar. 2, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–107—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for Department of Defense Nuclear Forces. Mar. 2, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–108—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Marine Corps 2017 Operations and Maintenance Budget Request and Readiness Posture. Mar. 3, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–109—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The U.S. Transportation Command Fiscal Year 2017 Readiness Posture. Mar. 15, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–110—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for National Security Space. Mar. 15, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–111—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Military Departments. Mar. 16, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–112—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request for U.S. Cyber Command: Preparing for Operations in the Cyber Domain. Mar. 16, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–113—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2017 Army and Air Force Rotorcraft Modernization Programs. Mar. 16, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–114—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Department of the

Navy 2017 Operations and Maintenance Budget Request and Readiness Posture. Mar. 17, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–115—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense. Mar. 22, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–116—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Logistics and Sealift Force Requirements. Mar. 22, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–117—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2017 Information Technology and Cyber Programs: Foundations for a Secure Warfighting Network. Mar. 22, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–118—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Update on the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Program and the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Request. Mar. 23, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–119—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Building the Navy of the Future: A Look at Navy Force Structure. Apr. 13, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–120—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Missile Defeat Posture and Strategy of the United States—the Fiscal Year 2017 President’s Budget Request. Apr. 14, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–121—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Evaluating DOD Investments: Case Studies in Afghanistan Initiatives and U.S. Weapons Sustainment. Apr. 15, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–122—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on U.S. Industry Perspectives on the Department of Defense’s Policies, Roles and Responsibilities for Foreign Military Sales. May 11, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–123—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Assessing the Department of Defense’s Execution of Responsibilities in the U.S. Foreign Military Sales Program. May 17, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–124—Subcommittees on Seapower and Projection Forces and Readiness joint hearing on Navy Force Structure and Readiness: Perspectives from the Fleet. May 26, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–125—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Stopping the Money Flow: The War on Terror Finance (joint with Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade of the Committee on Foreign Affairs). June 9, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–126—Full Committee hearing on Department of Defense Update on the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Plan. June 15, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–127—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Air Dominance and the Critical Role of Fifth Generation Fighter Aircraft. June 18, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–128—Full Committee hearing on Military Cyber Operations. June 22, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–129—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Aviation Readiness. July 6, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–130—Full Committee hearing on Goldwater-Nichols Reform: The Way Ahead. July 7, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–131—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on South China Sea Maritime Disputes (joint with Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs). July 7, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–132—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Air Dominance and the Critical Role of Fifth Generation Fighters. July 13, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–133—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Oversight of the European Reassurance Initiative. July 13, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–134—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Naval Dominance in Undersea Warfare. July 14, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–135—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on President Obama’s Nuclear Deterrent Modernization Plans and Budgets: The Military Requirements. July 14, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–136—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Deferred Maintenance in the Nuclear Security Enterprise: Safety and Mission Risks. Sept. 7, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–137—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Views on H.R. 4298: Vietnam Helicopter Crew Memorial Act and H.R. 5458: Veterans TRICARE Choice Act. Sept. 8, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–138—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Next Generation Air Space Control—Ensuring Air Force Compliance by January 1, 2020. Sept. 14, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–139—Full Committee hearing on 15 Years after 9–11: The State of the Fight Against Islamic Terrorism. Sept. 21, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–140—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Seapower and Projection Forces in the South China Sea. Sept. 21, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–141—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Security Space: 21st Century Challenges, 20th Century Organization. Sept. 27, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–142—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Department of Defense Laboratories: Innovation through Science and Engineering in Support of Military Operations. Sept. 28, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–143—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Force Management Levels in Iraq and Afghanistan; Readiness and Strategic Considerations. Dec. 1, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–144—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on California National Guard Bonus Repayment Issue. Dec. 7, 2016.

H.A.S.C. 114–145—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Oversight Review of the U.S. Navy’s Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Program. Dec. 8, 2016.

## PRESS RELEASES

## FIRST SESSION

December 2015:

- 12/31/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: January 4–8
  - 12/17/15—Thornberry On Defense Secretary's Improper Use Of Personal Email For Official Business
  - 12/16/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: Dec. 21–Jan. 1
  - 12/11/15—Chairmen Nunes, Thornberry, Frelinghuysen Announce Creation of Joint Task Force to Investigate Allegations of Intelligence Manipulation
  - 12/10/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: December 14–18
  - 12/10/15—Thornberry/Hartzler On Release Of Taliban 5 Report
  - 12/9/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes
  - 12/9/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck
  - 12/8/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers
  - 12/7/15—Byrne/Gallego To Host Press Conference With Colombian Ambassador
  - 12/6/15—Chairman Thornberry on the President's Address to the Nation
  - 12/3/15—Heck Statement on Secretary Carter's Announcement Opening All Combat Jobs to Women
  - 12/3/15—Armed Services Committee Chairmen Statement On Decision To Open All Combat Positions To Women
  - 12/3/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck
  - 12/3/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman
  - 12/2/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: December 7–11
  - 12/2/15—Thornberry On WSJ GTMO Story
  - 12/1/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers
  - 12/1/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes
  - 12/1/15—Chairman Thornberry's Opening Remarks
- November 2015:
- 11/25/15—National Defense Authorization Act for 2016 Becomes Law
  - 11/25/15—Armed Services Committee Leaders on Kunduz Investigation
  - 11/24/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 30—December 4
  - 11/19/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 23–27
  - 11/19/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson
  - 11/18/15—Thornberry on White House Decision to Delay GTMO Plan
  - 11/18/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 16–20
  - 11/17/15—Thornberry On OPM/DHS/OMB Failure to Appear Before HASC
  - 11/16/15—Thornberry To Host Press Gaggle Tuesday
  - 11/15—/15—Thornberry Talks Paris Attacks With Maria Bartiromo
  - 11/13/15—Thornberry on Paris Attacks
  - 11/10/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 16–20
  - 11/4/15—FY16 NDAA Resource Kit
  - 11/4/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 9–13
  - 11/3/15—FY16 NDAA
  - 11/3/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers
  - 11/3/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes

## October 2015:

10/30/15—Thornberry On Reports Of White House Decision To Send Troops To Syria

10/28/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck

10/28/15—Opening Remarks of Chairwoman Hartzler

10/28/15—Thornberry To Host Press Gaggle Today

10/27/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 2–6

10/27/15—Thornberry To Support Bipartisan Budget Agreement

10/27/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes

10/26/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: October 26–30

10/22/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson

10/22/15—President Will Veto the Defense Bill

10/22/15—Thornberry, McCain and Congressional Iraq and Afghanistan Vets on NDAA Veto

10/21/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Turner

10/20/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: October 26–30

10/15/15—Thornberry On Afghanistan Troop Levels

10/14/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: October 19–23

10/9/15—Thornberry on President's Failed Syria Policy

10/9/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: October 12–16

10/8/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck

10/8/15—Thornberry Previews Afghanistan Hearing

10/7/15—Thornberry on NDAA Passage

10/7/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers

10/6/15—Thornberry To Army: Postpone Martland Discharge

10/6/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: October 5–9

10/5/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: October 5–9

10/1/15—Defense Bill Passes 270–156

10/1/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman

## September 2015:

9/30/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: October 5–9

9/30/15—Cyber Week Readout

9/30/15—Thornberry on Defense Bill Veto Threat

9/30/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Thornberry

9/29/15—Thornberry Releases NDAA Conference Report

9/29/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes

9/29/15—House/Senate Armed Services Leaders To Discuss NDAA

9/28/15—Thornberry on Kunduz

9/22/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: September 28—October 2

9/18/15—Wilson Previews Roundtable

9/11/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: September 14–18

9/11/15—Thornberry On 9/11 Anniversary

9/10/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers

9/10/15—Thornberry Availability On Iran

9/10/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman

9/9/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes

9/7/15—Thornberry Returns from Afghanistan

9/4/15—Thornberry To Host Press Gaggle Tuesday

9/2/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: September 7–11

## July 2015:

7/30/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: August 3—September 4

7/29/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Thornberry

7/21/15—Thornberry Calls On President To Lower Flags

7/17/15—Armed Services Chairmen Advancing Legislation to Protect Troops at U.S. Military Facilities  
 7/16/15—Thornberry On Murder Of Four Marines  
 7/16/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: July 20–24  
 7/14/15—Thornberry on Iran Announcement  
 7/10/15—In Wake Of Breach Thornberry To Examine Force Protection And Security Clearance Process  
 7/10/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: July 13–17  
 7/9/15—Thornberry on United Kingdom’s Commitment to National Defense  
 7/8/15—Thornberry on Army Force Reductions  
 7/6/15—Thornberry on President’s ISIL Update  
 7/3/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: July 6–11  
 7/1/15—Thornberry on Iran Nuclear Agreement  
 June 2015:  
 6/26/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 29–July 3  
 6/26/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 6/25/15—NDAA Conference Begins  
 6/25/15—Opening Remarks of Chairwoman Hartzler  
 6/25/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Thornberry  
 6/24/15—Opening Remarks Of Chairman Wilson  
 6/22/15—Update: HASC Hearing Schedule: June 22–26  
 6/22/15—Thornberry To Deliver Remarks on Russia To The Atlantic Council  
 6/19/15—Update: HASC Hearing Schedule: June 22–26  
 6/19/15—Thornberry on Senate Passage of FY16 NDAA  
 6/17/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes  
 6/16/15—Thornberry Previews Hearing on U.S. Policy & Strategy in the Middle East  
 6/15/15—Thornberry To Host Press Gaggle Tuesday  
 6/12/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 15–19  
 6/11/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck  
 6/10/15—READOUT: Wilson & Langevin Host Briefing on DoD’s Transfer of Live Anthrax  
 6/10/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 15–19  
 6/10/15—Thornberry on Additional U.S. Forces in Iraq  
 6/10/15—Thornberry/Wilson/Langevin Brief On Camera Availability Before Anthrax Briefing  
 6/8/15—Thornberry to Host Press Gaggle Tuesday  
 6/4/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 8–12  
 6/3/15—Thornberry to Reid: Meeting Troops’ Needs Is Never A Waste Of Time  
 6/2/15—Readout: Thornberry Comments on CJCS Roundtable with Armed Services Committee  
 6/2/15—Readout: Thornberry Comments on CJCS Roundtable with Armed Services Committee  
 6/2/15—Readout: Thornberry Comments on CJCS Roundtable with Armed Services Committee  
 May 2015:  
 5/28/15—Thornberry/Hartzler on Anniversary of Taliban 5 Transfer  
 5/28/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 1–5  
 5/20/15—Thornberry on President’s Address to Coast Guard Grads

5/18/15—Thornberry & Smith Statement on Iraq Train & Equip Language in NDAA

5/15/15—House Passes NDAA

5/12/15—H.R. 1735 FY16 NDAA Comes to the House Floor

5/11/15—Thornberry to Host Press Gaggle Tuesday

5/5/15—Thornberry on General Dunford

April 2015:

4/30/15—H.R. 1735 Passes House Armed Services Committee

4/29/15—Thornberry on FY16 NDAA Markup

4/27/15—Thornberry Releases Defense Authorization Act

4/23/15—Thornberry on Weinstein & Lo Porto

4/23/15—UPDATE: FY16 NDAA Subcommittee Markup Schedule

4/23/15—Opening Statement of Chairman Heck

4/23/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Turner

4/22/15—Opening Statement of Chairman Wittman

4/22/15—Chairman Wilson's Opening Statement

4/22/15—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Markup Release

4/22/15—Subcommittee on Seapower & Projection Forces Markup Release

4/22/15—Subcommittee on Military Personnel Markup Release

4/22/15—Subcommittee on Tactical Air & Land Markup Release

4/21/15—Subcommittee on Readiness Markup

4/21/15—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats & Capabilities Markup

4/21/15—FY16 NDAA Subcommittee Markup Press Background Briefings

4/20/15—Thornberry to Host Press Gaggle Tuesday

4/17/15—HASC to Distribute NDAA Amendments by Email

4/15/15—Chairman Rogers' Opening Statement

4/15/15—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes

4/15/15—HASC Staff Host OTR Session on NDAA Markup Logistics

4/14/15—Thornberry, Smith Begin FY 2016 Defense Process

4/14/15—Opening Statement of Chairman Turner

4/14/15—UPDATE: FY16 NDAA Markup Schedule

4/10/15—Thornberry on Major General Post

4/8/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: April 13–17

4/2/15—Thornberry Releases the FY16 NDAA Markup Schedule

March 2015:

3/31/15—Thornberry on Egypt

3/26/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: March 30–April 10

3/26/15—Chairman Wilson's Opening Statement

3/26/15—Opening Statement of Chairman Turner

3/26/15—Opening Statement of Chairman Wittman

3/25/15—Opening Statement of Chairman Rogers

3/25/15—Chairman Wilson's Opening Statement

3/25/15—Thornberry on Bergdahl

3/25/15—Thornberry/Smith Introduce DOD Acquisition Reform Bill

3/25/15—Opening Statement of Chairman Heck

3/24/15—Thornberry Welcomes Rep. Russell

3/24/15—Opening Statement of Chairman Rogers'

3/24/15—Thornberry on Afghanistan

3/23/15—Chairman Thornberry Unveils Defense Reform Proposal

3/20/15—Thornberry to Unveil Reform Proposal at CSIS  
 3/19/15—Armed Services Staff Background Briefing on Acquisition Reform  
 3/18/15—Thornberry Announces Selection for National Commission on the Future of the U.S. Army  
 3/18/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: March 23–27  
 3/18/15—Chairman Wilson’s Opening Statement  
 3/18/15—Chairman Forbes’ Opening Statement  
 3/17/15—Chairman Rogers’ Opening Statement  
 3/16/15—Thornberry Previews Hearing on The Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Budget  
 3/13/15—Media Alert: Thornberry to Host Press Gaggle Monday  
 3/12/15—HASC Hearing Schedule Update: March 17  
 3/10/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: March 16–20  
 3/4/15—Chairman Wittman’s Opening Statement  
 3/4/15—Thursday March 5 Hearing Postponed  
 3/4/15—Chairman Wilson’s Opening Statement  
 3/4/15—Chairman Forbes’ Opening Statement  
 February 2015:  
 2/27/15—Thornberry Releases Budget Views & Estimates Letter  
 2/25/15—Chairman Thornberry Previews Tomorrow’s AUMF Hearing  
 2/25/15—Chairman Wilson’s Opening Statement  
 2/25/15—Chairman Forbes’ Opening Statement  
 2/24/15—HASC Hearing Schedule: March 2–6  
 2/24/15—Thornberry Previews Hearing on Emerging Security Challenges in Europe  
 2/19/15—HASC Hearing Announcement: AUMF  
 2/4/15—Thornberry Names Armed Services Vice Chairs  
 2/2/15—Thornberry on President’s Budget Request  
 January 2015:  
 1/28/15—Thornberry, Smith Announce Final Subcommittee Rosters  
 1/21/15—READOUT: Thornberry Leads Roundtable on Islamic Extremism  
 1/20/15—Chairman Thornberry Highlights Critical National Security Challenges ahead of SOTU  
 1/16/15—Media Alert: Thornberry to Unveil Agenda in AEI Remarks  
 1/15/15—Thornberry on GTMO Transfers: “The American People are Right to be Concerned”  
 1/7/15—Chairman Thornberry: “America Stands With France”

## SECOND SESSION

December 2016:  
 12/6/16—Statement by Thornberry & McCain on Defense Business Board Findings on Pentagon Bureaucracy  
 12/2/16—House passes NDAA Conference Report 375 to 34  
 12/1/16—Thornberry on Mattis Selection  
 November 2016:  
 11/20/16—Thornberry files FY17 NDAA Conference Report  
 11/30/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: December 5–9  
 11/29/16—Armed Services Staff Background Briefing on NDAA today

11/22/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 28–December 2  
 11/20/16—Thornberry on National Security Agency reports  
 11/18/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 21–25  
 11/16/16—Thornberry & Smith on passing of Mel Laird  
 11/10/16—Thornberry on Additional Funding Request  
 11/10/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 14–18  
 11/1/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: November 1–11  
 October 2016:  
 10/27/16—Thornberry on Marine CH-53 Investigation  
 10/26/16—House Armed Services Committee Leaders on sus-  
 pending collection of bonuses  
 10/19/16—Thornberry, Nunes warn of Russian Nuke Violations  
 10/4/16—Thornberry on alarming developments with New Start  
 Treaty  
 September 2016:  
 9/30/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: October  
 9/29/16—Thornberry on Iraq Troop Deployments  
 9/28/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson  
 9/28/16—National Security Council on Relationship With China:  
 It's Complicated, Not a Competition  
 9/27/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 9/22/16—Update: HASC Hearing Schedule: September 19–23  
 9/21/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes  
 9/21/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: September 26–30  
 9/15/16—Thornberry on Walorski Bill to Stop GTMO Transfers  
 9/14/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: September 19–23  
 9/9/16—Thornberry on North Korea Nuclear Test  
 9/9/16—In Remembrance of September 11, 2001  
 9/8/16—Govt Watchdog Sounds Alarm on Readiness  
 9/8/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck  
 9/8/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: September 12–16  
 9/7/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 9/6/16—Thornberry: The American People/Our Troops Deserve  
 Better  
 9/1/16—Thornberry Denounces President's Decision on Troop Pay  
 August 2016:  
 8/31/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: September 5–9  
 8/31/16—Thornberry Praises Army Rapid Capabilities office  
 8/26/16—GTMO to Close?  
 8/11/16—Congressional Task Force on Centcom Releases Initial  
 Report  
 8/1/16—Thornberry Statement on Khizr Khan Speech/Military  
 Service  
 July 2016:  
 7/22/16—Thornberry to Host “off Camera” Press Round Table  
 Monday  
 7/20/16—Thornberry Remembers Representative Takai  
 7/15/16—HASC Hearing Schedule—July–August  
 7/14/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 7/14/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes  
 7/14/16—Update: HASC Hearing Schedule: July 10–16  
 7/13/16—Opening Remarks of Chairwoman Hartzler  
 7/13/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Turner

7/13/16—Rogers Urges President to Stay the Course on Nuclear Modernization

7/12/16—Congress to Commissary Customers: We Have Your Back

7/12/16—Thornberry on South China Sea Ruling

7/11/16—Thornberry on White House Sending More Troops to Iraq

7/8/16—Thornberry on Secdef Afghanistan Comments

7/8/16—Thornberry on Thaad In South Korea

7/8/16—NDAA Goes to Conference

7/7/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes

7/6/16—Thornberry on President's New Afghanistan Troop Caps

7/6/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman

7/5/16—Thornberry to Discuss FY17 NDAA at Heritage

June 2016:

6/30/16—Update: HASC Hearing Schedule: July 4–8

6/30/16—Chairman Thornberry on Pentagon Transgender Policy Change

6/29/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: July 4–8

6/24/16—Thornberry on Change to DOD Transgender Policy

6/21/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 27–July 1

6/20/16—Military Aircraft Accidents Costing Lives

6/15/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 20–24

6/15/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Thornberry

6/13/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 13–18

6/12/16—Thornberry Statement on Orlando Attack

6/9/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 13–17

6/3/16—Thornberry Comments on Recent Military Casualties

6/2/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: June 6–10

May 2016:

5/26/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes

5/25/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: May 30–June 3

5/25/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman

5/20/16—Update: HASC Hearing Schedule: May 23–27

5/18/16—Defense Bill Passes the House

5/18/16—The Importance of Replacing Worn Out Equipment

5/17/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: May 23–27

5/17/16—“The Bill Payer For a Lack of Readiness Is...”

5/16/16—Defense Bill Comes to the House Floor

5/16/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: May 16–20

5/11/16—Thornberry Introduces Major Reforms to National Security Council

5/11/16—‘They Were For It Before They Were Against It’

5/11/16—Opening Remarks of Chairwoman Hartzler

5/5/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: May 9–13

5/3/16—U.S. Air Power Needs an F-22 Upgrade

5/3/16—Marine Corps Times: Fighter Squadrons Don’t Have Enough Working Aircraft

5/2/16—Cutting Readiness is What’s Objectionable

5/2/16—The Hill: Experts Warn Weapons Gap Is Shrinking Between US, Russia and China

April 2016:

4/28/16—Thornberry on Committee Passage of NDAA

4/27/16—Opening Statement of Chairman Thornberry

4/25/16—Thornberry Releases FY17 NDAA  
 4/21/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 4/21/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson  
 4/21/16—FY17 NDAA Full Committee Markup  
 4/21/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman  
 4/20/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes  
 4/20/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Turner  
 4/20/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck  
 4/19/16—Subcommittee on Military Personnel  
 4/19/16—Subcommittee on Seapower & Projection Forces  
 4/19/16—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats & Capabilities  
 4/19/16—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces  
 4/19/16—Subcommittee on Tactical Air & Land Forces  
 4/19/16—Subcommittee on Readiness  
 4/18/16—Subcommittee Markup Press Briefings  
 4/15/16—Opening Remarks of Chairwoman Hartzler  
 4/15/16—Thornberry on Dod Brac Report  
 4/14/16—Subcommittee Markup Press Briefings  
 4/14/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 4/14/16—HASC Markup Schedule  
 4/13/16—HASC to Distribute NDAA Amendments By Email  
 4/13/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes  
 4/12/16—Thornberry, Smith Begin FY17 National Defense Authorization Process  
 4/11/16—HASC Staff Host OTR Session on NDAA Markup Logistics  
 4/7/16—HASC Hearing Schedule April 11–15  
 March 2016:  
 3/24/16—HASC Hearing Schedule  
 3/24/16—Thornberry Comments on Administration's ISIL Strategy  
 3/23/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Turner  
 3/22/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson  
 3/22/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes  
 3/22/16—Chairman Thornberry's Opening Remarks  
 3/17/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman  
 3/16/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Turner  
 3/16/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson  
 3/15/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 3/15/16—Thornberry Releases Acquisition Reform Bill  
 3/15/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman  
 3/15/16—HASC Hearing Schedule  
 3/14/16—Thornberry Discusses Defense Acquisition Reform Proposals at Brookings  
 3/14/16—HASC Staff to Background Press on Acquisition Reform  
 3/13/16—Thornberry Discusses Defense Acquisition Reform Proposals at Brookings  
 3/11/16—HASC Staff to Background Press on Acquisition Reform  
 3/11/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: March 14–18  
 3/10/16—Thornberry on Iran Missile Tests  
 3/9/16—UPDATE: HASC Hearing Schedule: March 14–18  
 3/8/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: March 14–18  
 3/3/16—HASC Hearing Schedule  
 3/3/16—Thornberry to Host Press Gaggle Today

3/3/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman  
 3/2/16—Thornberry to Host Press Gaggle Thursday  
 3/2/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Turner  
 3/2/16—Thornberry to Host Press Gaggle Thursday  
 3/2/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 3/1/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson  
 3/1/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes  
 February 2016:  
 2/26/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck  
 2/26/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman  
 2/25/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Forbes  
 2/24/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck  
 2/24/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 2/24/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson  
 2/24/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: February 29–March 4  
 2/23/16—Thornberry Comments on White House's Plan to Close  
 GTMO  
 2/17/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: February 22–26  
 2/16/16—White House Fails to Deliver Strategy to Counter Is-  
 lamic Extremism  
 2/12/16—Opening Remarks of Chairwoman Hartzler  
 2/12/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman  
 2/11/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 2/11/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: February 15–19  
 2/10/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson  
 2/10/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Turner  
 2/9/16—Thornberry Comments on DOD Budget Proposal  
 2/8/16—Thornberry Sends Views & Estimates to The Budget  
 Committee  
 2/7/16—Thornberry Statement on North Korean Missile Launch  
 2/4/16—Thornberry Reminds White House of Statutory Require-  
 ments for GTMO Report  
 2/3/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: February 8–12  
 2/3/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wilson  
 2/3/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck  
 2/2/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Thornberry  
 2/2/16—Thornberry on Secretary Carter's FY17 Budget Preview  
 January 2016:  
 1/29/16—Thornberry to Host Press Gaggle Monday  
 1/25/16—UPDATE: HASC Hearing Schedule: January 25–29  
 1/14/16—Thornberry on release of 10 more GTMO detainees  
 1/14/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: January 18–22  
 1/13/16—Thornberry's Remarks As Prepared For Delivery  
 1/13/16—Thornberry Discusses Strength & Agility In National  
 Security Speech  
 1/13/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Heck  
 1/13/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman  
 1/12/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Rogers  
 1/12/16—Thornberry to Deliver National Security Speech at Na-  
 tional Press Club  
 1/8/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Wittman  
 1/7/16—Thornberry to Deliver National Security Speech at Na-  
 tional Press Club  
 1/7/16—Opening Remarks of Chairman Thornberry

1/6/16—Thornberry on North Korea Nuke Test  
1/5/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: January 11–15  
1/5/16—HASC Hearing Schedule: January 4–8  
1/5/16—Thornberry to Deliver National Security Speech at National Press Club

